REPORT RESUMES

ED 017 592 UD 005 347

NOTES AND WORKING PAPERS CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED UNDER TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, PROGRAM PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN.

CONGRESS OF THE U.S., WASHINGTON, D.C., SENATE

PUB DATE DEC 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$6.88 170P.

DESCRIPTORS- *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, *CASE STUDIES (EDUCATION), *PRIVATE SCHOOLS, *ENROLLMENT, *EXPENDITURES, DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, TABLES (DATA), DATA, SCHOOL DISTRICTS, SCHOOL SURVEYS, STATE AGENCIES, BIBLIOGRAPHIES, ESEA TITLE 1

THIS EVALUATION REPORT ON THE PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN IN TITLE I PROJECTS IS BASED ON CASE STUDIES OF 10 LARGE, 10 MEDIUM, AND 10 SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES. THE STUDIES WERE PREPARED THROUGH THE EFFORTS OF 14 FIELD SURVEY COORDINATORS WHO INTERVIEWED PUBLIC AND NONPUBLIC SCHOOL REPRESENTATIVES AT BOTH THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL. TABLES CONTAINING BASIC DATA FROM THE STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES, A GLOSSARY OF TERMS, AND A BIBLIOGRAPHY ON TITLE I AND OTHER COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS ARE INCLUDED IN THIS REPORT. THIS DOCUMENT IS ALSO AVAILABLE FROM THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS, U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20402. (LB)

05347

ED017592

UD 005 347

90th Congress } COMMITTEE PRINT
1st Session }

NOTES AND WORKING PAPERS CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMS

AUTHORIZED UNDER

TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

PROGRAM PARTICIPATION OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN

PREPARED FOR THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

UNITED STATES SENATE

DECEMBER 1967

Printed for the use of the Committee on Labor and
Public Welfare

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
84-775 WASHINGTON : 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

LISTER HILL, Alabama, *Chairman*

WAYNE MORSE, Oregon
RALPH YARBOROUGH, Texas
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey
CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
GAYLORD NELSON, Wisconsin
ROBERT F. KENNEDY, New York

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
GEORGE MURPHY, California
PAUL J. FANNIN, Arizona
ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

STEWART E. McCLURE, *Chief Clerk*
JOHN S. FORSYTHE, *General Counsel*
EUGENE MITTELMAN, *Minority Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

WAYNE MORSE, Oregon, *Chairman*

LISTER HILL, Alabama
RALPH YARBOROUGH, Texas
JOSEPH S. CLARK, Pennsylvania
JENNINGS RANDOLPH, West Virginia
ROBERT F. KENNEDY, New York
HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey

WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont
JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
GEORGE MURPHY, California

CHARLES LEE, *Professional Staff Member*
ROY H. MILLENSON, *Minority Clerk*

UD 002 344

FOREWORD

The materials which follow in this volume of the notes and working papers series concerning the administration of programs authorized under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, constitute an examination of the impact of title I upon the education of the non-public-school child.

The report was prepared under contract by Boston College for the Commissioner of Education and it was made available to the subcommittee by him. The purpose of the contract was to obtain, using the case study method, an independent evaluation and appraisal, upon a national basis, of the operation of one facet of the title I authority.

In April of 1967, the subcommittee published the Miller report on the operation and administration of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Since the present volume should be viewed in the same light as the precursor, it is perhaps fitting at this point for me to repeat what I said in my earlier foreword:

> I wish to emphasize that the opinions, conclusions and recommendations of the group are those of independent educators and do not necessarily reflect either the views of the Office of Education or of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.
>
> This is as it should be. The report will stand or fall on its merits. I do wish, however, to express my appreciation to the Commissioner of Education for providing the subcommittee with these materials which can be most useful to it in the conduct of the legislative oversight responsibilities of the subcommittee in this area.

To Dr. Vincent C. Nuccio, project administrator, and to Dr. John J. Walsh, research director of the Boston College study, I wish to express the appreciation of the subcommittee for these useful materials, which I know will be of interest, not only to Senators, but to a great many members of the educational community.

WAYNE MORSE,
Chairman, Education Subcommittee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
Project staff ---- VIII
Acknowledgments ---- IX
Foreword ---- XI

Chapter—

I. Introduction ---- 1
II. Case studies—10 large school systems ---- 7
III. Case studies—10 medium school systems ---- 53
IV. Case studies—10 small school systems ---- 91
V. Analysis, summary, and conclusions ---- 135
Glossary of terms ---- 153
Bibliography ---- 155

LIST OF TABLES

1. SEA basic State data, case No. L–1 ---- 8
2. LEA data, case No. L–1 ---- 9
3. SEA basic State data, case No. L–2 ---- 13
4. LEA data, case No. L–2 ---- 15
5. SEA basic State data, case No. L–3 ---- 17
6. LEA data, case No. L–3 ---- 18
7. SEA basic State data, case No. L–4 ---- 20
8. LEA data, case No. L–4 ---- 22
9. SEA basic State data, case No. L–5 ---- 25
10. LEA data, case No. L–5 ---- 27
11. SEA basic State data, case No. L–6 ---- 30
12. LEA data, case No. L–6 ---- 32
13. SEA basic State data, case No. L–7 ---- 35
14. LEA data, case No. L–7 ---- 37
15. SEA basic State data, case No. L–8 ---- 40
16. LEA data, case No. L–8 ---- 40
17. SEA basic State data, case No. L–9 ---- 42
18. LEA data, case No. L–9 ---- 44
19. SEA basic State data, case No. L–10 ---- 48
20. LEA data, case No. L–10 ---- 49
21. SEA basic State data, case No. M–1 ---- 53
22. LEA data, case No. M–1 ---- 55
23. SEA basic State data, case No. M–2 ---- 59
24. LEA data, case No. M–2 ---- 60
25. SEA basic State data, case No. M–3 ---- 63
26. LEA data, case No. M–3 ---- 64
27. SEA basic State data, case No. M–4 ---- 66
28. LEA data, case No. M–4 ---- 67
29. SEA basic State data, case No. M–5 ---- 68
30. LEA data, case No. M–5 ---- 69
31. SEA basic State data, case No. M–6 ---- 71
32. LEA data, case No. M–6 ---- 74
33. SEA basic State data, case No. M–7 ---- 77
34. LEA data, case No. M–7 ---- 77
35. SEA basic State data, case No. M–8 ---- 80
36. LEA data, case No. M–8 ---- 83
37. SEA basic State data, case No. M–9 ---- 84
38. LEA data, case No. M–9 ---- 85
39. SEA basic State data, case No. M–10 ---- 87

LIST OF TABLES—Continued

Page
40. LEA data, case No. M–10 89
41. SEA basic State data, case No. S–1 91
42. LEA data, case No. S–1 92
43. SEA basic State data, case No. S–2 95
44. LEA data, case No. S–2 97
45. SEA basic State data, case No. S–3 100
46. LEA data, case No. S–3 102
47. SEA basic State data, case N. S–4 103
48. LEA data, case No. S–4 105
49. SEA basic State data, case No. S–5 106
50. LEA data, case No. S–5 108
51. SEA basic State data, case No. S–6 110
52. LEA data, case No. S–6 113
53. SEA basic State data, case No. S–7 116
54. LEA data, case No. S–7 118
55. SEA basic State data, case No. S–8 120
56. LEA data, case No. S–8 121
57. SEA basic State data, case No. S–9 123
58. LEA data, case No. S–9 125
59. SEA basic State data, case No. S–10 129
60. LEA data, case No. S–10 131
61. Rank order correlations between one-half State average per pupil expenditure (1963–64) and SEA expenditure per participant in title I projects 136
62. Rank order correlations between SEA expenditure per participant and State rank for percent of nonpublic school participants in title I projects 136
63. Rank order correlations between LEA expenditure per participant and LEA rank for percent of nonpublic school participants in title I projects 137
64 Rank order correlations between LEA percent of nonpublic school participants in LEA eligible participant ratio 137
65. Frequency and percentage of project types for large, medium, and small LEA's 151

PHASE I FINAL REPORT

A NATIONAL LEVEL EVALUATION STUDY OF THE IMPACT OF TITLE I OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 ON THE PARTICIPATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN

SUBMITTED TO THE U.S. COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION UNDER THE
PROVISION OF PUBLIC LAW 89–10

PREPARED BY

DR. VINCENT C. NUCCIO, PROJECT ADMINISTRATOR
DR. JOHN J. WALSH, RESEARCH DIRECTOR

Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167

PROJECT STAFF

Dr. Vincent C. Nuccio, project administrator, assistant to the president, Boston College
Dr. John J. Walsh, research director, director, office of educational research, Boston College
Sister Marijane Werner, O.P., research associate
Mr. Peter Murphy, research assistant
Mr. Robert Hayes, research assistant
Miss Angela Rositano, project secretary

FIELD SURVEY COORDINATORS

Dr. Donald Biggs, office of the dean of students, University of Minnesota
Dr. Michael Caldwell, Ohio State University
Mr. Gerald Cecere, Counseling Center, Seton Hall University
Dr. Robert Cummins, University of Mississippi
Dr. Joseph Dameron, Southern Methodist University
Dr. Gabriel Della-Piana, University of Utah
Dr. Donald Erickson, associate professor of education, University of Chicago
Mr. Harry Hadley, graduate assistant to dean, West Virginia University
Dr. Prince Jackson, Savannah State College
Dr. John Jensen, acting director, Computing Center, Boston College
Dr. George Madaus, research director of New England Catholic Education Center, Boston College
Dr. Robert S. Miller, Counseling Center, Central Washington State College
Dr. Omer Rupiper, University of Oklahoma
Dr. John Schmitt, director, office of testing services, Boston College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are indebted to the members of the project staff—Sister Marijane Werner, O.P., research associate; Mr. Peter Murphy and Mr. Robert Hayes, research assistants—and to Miss Angela Rositano, project secretary, for their outstanding efforts during phase I of this study.

Our special thanks to the 14 field survey coordinators through whose efforts we were able to prepare the 30 case studies. They have devoted many hours and covered thousands of miles to interview representatives of the public and nonpublic sectors at both the State and local levels.

Gratitude is also expressed to the representatives of the U.S. Office of Education for their valuable assistance and advice during the course of this project.

A special word of thanks is extended to Miss Nancy Boutilier, Messrs. Joseph Foley and David Hilton, for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript.

Vincent C. Nuccio.
John J. Walsh.

FOREWORD

Since the founding days of our National Republic, laws have been enacted not only to enhance the ordinary process of democratic government, but also to serve as guidelines to the implementation for all citizens of the American dream of opportunity. From colonial days the key to opportunity has been equated with good schooling and good education. Thus, our Founding Fathers built our Nation and its laws upon the concept that opportunity for all means education for all.

For many decades, governmental responsibility toward education was fulfilled at the local and State levels. Yet, with the advent of rapid transportation and communication, with the phenomenon of a highly mobile population, and with an ever-growing economic cleavage between rich and poor, the Federal Government in recent years has taken an increased interest in the extent to which opportunity is available to all American children. For many decades our National Government has been unable to enact constructive educational laws for many reasons, paramount among which was the unwritten American tradition of the touchy and multifaceted church-state dilemma.

In 1965 the Federal Government, after many months of deliberation and compromise, enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which was a tribute to the 89th Congress and a masterpiece of ingenuity in circumventing old problems and in producing legislation geared to the equalization of opportunity for all citizens through quality education. The lion's share of ESEA programs and appropriations centers arount a human problem, the alleviation of which seldom falls under law, and whose surcease cannot be hampered by tradition: the problem of poverty and its degrading human, social, and economic stepchildren. The poor of our Nation have become spectators to the panorama of American affluence and abundance. While their heads and hearts reach out to the mainstream of the good life, their hands have neither the educational nor technical fingers with which to grasp a share of that good life for themselves or their children. Most apparently these poor Americans huddle in the ghettos of our large urban areas, but closer scrutiny reveals them also to be found everywhere in our hidden America.

The needs of the children of the poor are their common bond and our Nation's common shame. They are black and white, urban and rural, Northern and Southern, in both public and nonpublic schools.

The eligibility of poor children everywhere for intensive and immediate governmental action through massive educational legislation is beyond the arena of traditional debate and longstanding vested interest. This eligibility is what title I has clearly legislated. However, to translate legislative responsibility into programs and services which will adequately carry out the intent of Congress is a task that demands constant and careful evaluation. With particular respect to the poor who subscribe to nonpublic education for their children, new techniques had to be devised to measure the framework rather than the substance of title I programs as they benefit these non-public-school children. In essence, this framework consists of the new patterns of initiative, understanding and cooperation—all too often lacking in the past and all too often based upon competition rather than cooperation—which must provide the setting for projects and programs under title I.

The first area of evaluation is based upon a gathering of evidence and insights at the local level which spawns the local title I project and is responsible for its function and effectiveness. The responsibility for launching a fundable title I project rests with the local public school administration. Thus, there is the need to cast-study public authorities in their procedures for estimating common educational, cultural, and related needs of the district's poor. Where a number of these poor are in nonpublic schools, an effective program demands the knowledge not merely of the needs of deprived children in public education but the commensurate needs of their non-public-school counterparts. Common needs demand communication, and this first new pattern of dialog between public and private school authorities is frequently a new level of dialog and cooperation. In the past contacts between these sectors were often cordial, but were infrequent and were concerned with the periphery, and not the substance, of education. Cooperation is a mutual enterprise. Consequently, desire and initiative on the part of public school authorities are futile without corresponding interest and activity on the part of non-public-school personnel. A study of the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of title I in the local setting begins with a study in human relations and human dynamics. Legislation cannot mandate this framework, but evaluation of the fulfillment of legislative enactments can provide new guidelines and directives for more intensive efforts at partnership and progress.

The second area of evaluation concerns itself with the role of State government and its educational agency in fulfilling its responsibility regarding the intention of title I. The State agency is charged with evaluating local programs. By and large, State departments of education have been involved mainly with workings of public education, and their interest in nonpublic schools, by mandate or by tradition, has been concerned with adequate education in nonpublic schools for legal purposes of attendance. State agencies have provided services to nonpublic schools and in some instances have administered fragmentary State educational benefits to non-public-school children, but in the main, nonpublic schools have never been considered a full-fledged member of the general educational community. The reasons for this tradition are manifold. A nonpublic school is basically a protest school, protesting the authority and responsibility of government alone to maintain, finance, and administer the total process of schooling. A nonpublic institution such as church-related education which over a period of time has maintained a separate identity beyond the scope of the public domain, is prone to enclavity because it need not inform a public larger than its own constituents. Because it need not conform to all public school legislation, as a nonrecipient of public funds it is often nonrecipient of the benefits of new and different legislation. Because it need not subscribe to the educational mainstream, it often becomes insular.

Title I has demanded that the State agency assume a new responsibility toward the children in nonpublic schools as recipients of local title I projects and programs in terms of both educational content and congressional intent. An evaluation of this State function and all of its ramifications is an essential part of an understanding of this total framework.

Thus, the scope of this report is to identify at the local and State level, in product and in process, the extent to which the intent of Congress and the legislation of title I itself has been realized for the children of citizens, victims of poverty, who have chosen to subscribe to the nonpublic sector of American education.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Education, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass., herein presents the phase I report of its national-level study of the impact of title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, on the participation of non-public-school children in this program. The period of the total study began on July 1, 1966, and will end on September 30, 1968. The approximate cost of the total study was estimated at $157,381. An initial grant of $76,747 for the first fiscal year was awarded in June 1966. The study was organized into two phases: The first, from July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967, has resulted in this report centering on public-nonpublic relationships, communications, program planning and development, implementation, and evaluation of projects funded under title I during this period of time. Phase I has been of a comprehensive, extensive, and diagnostic nature. This report has generated hypotheses to be tested in phase II. The second phase of the study, from July 1, 1967, to September 30, 1968, proposes to sponsor, fund, and coordinate a limited number of intensive, selective, and analytical companion in-depth studies focusing on critically important problem areas pinpointed during phase I.

OBJECTIVES

1. To study administrative relationship changes that have developed between public and nonpublic sectors at the Federal, State, and local level.
2. To describe the involvement of local non-public-school officials specifically in the areas of—
    - (*a*) Planning and development of the information that was used in filling out the original application forms.
    - (*b*) Operation and implementation of the projects.
    - (*c*) Evaluation of the projects.
3. To identify those factors which, in the judgment of public and non-public-school officials, have facilitated or impeded the development of relationships.
4. To identify constitutional, statutory, regulatory, and other possible legal barriers at the State and/or local levels related to participation of non-public-school children in title I projects.
5. To describe the characteristics of the non-public-school children participating in title I projects.
6. To determine the proportionate involvement of non-public-school children in title I projects.
7. To identify the factors (attitudinal, geographical, environmental, and so forth) which influence the extent of participation of eligible non-public-school children in title I projects.

8. To identify and describe practical operational problems which inhibit participation of non-public-school children in title I projects.

9. To describe the foci of title I projects available to non-public-school children.

10. To determine the relative importance of title I projects for eligible non-public-school children as perceived by public and non-public-school administrators and to solicit their recommendations for improving title I.

11.To identify and to describe existing or planned curriculum changes in nonpublic schools which are related to the participation of non-public-school children in title I projects.

12. To complete a limited number of intensive, selective, and analytical in-depth studies focusing on critically important problem areas suggested by phase I reports.

PROCEDURES, INSTRUMENTATION, AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

A letter from the U.S. Office of Education to the chief State school officer with a carbon copy to the State title I director announced the selection of each of the 30 school systems included in the sample. These were followed by letters from the administrator of the Boston College project to the State title I coordinators and to the diocesan superintendents. This correspondence notified the respective administrators of the project of the name and address of the field survey coordinator assigned to a given district, and of the school system selected for special study.

Phase I of the study has been completed with the professional assistance of 14 field survey coordinators. An all-day meeting of Boston College project staff, field survey coordinators, and resource people was held in the early part of October for purposes of orientation and consultation. A tentative outline of responsibilities for each field survey coordinator was discussed: (*a*) Collecting copies of LEA project applications for fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967, LEA evaluations of these projects, State evaluations of projects fiscal year 1966 which were sent to the U.S. Office of Education in December 1966. (*b*) compiling a list of names and addresses of LEA title I coordinators, nonpublic school regional directors, principals of public and nonpublic schools attended by children who participated and/or are participating in these programs, interested citizens, and civic leaders residing in the school districts selected for the study; and (*c*) conducting interviews with people mentioned in the above categories and with the State director of title I projects. The Boston College staff designed five different interview guides to meet the specific needs of the interviewee.

Boston College has assumed responsibility for receiving authorization from State and local educational authorities prior to undertaking the studies in districts selected for the sample. The U.S. Office of Education has assisted us in this matter. Capabilities from other sources have been requested and received.

Interview guides were designed for use by the field survey coordinator with each of the following groups: (1) State title I directors, (2) nonpublic school regional director(s) of Government programs, (3) LEA title I coordinators and other public school officials at the local level, (4) nonpublic school officials at the local level, and (5) interested citizens and civic leaders. This latter group included representatives of citizen advisory committees, members of boards of education, administrators of community action programs, attorneys and lawyers, professional people engaged in public relations and communications, university personnel serving as consultants for ESEA title I programs, and civil rights leaders. Over 250 interviews were conducted.

In addition to the interview guides, the Boston College project staff designed a form for gathering and summarizing meaningful data from the LEA applications for fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1966 State and local evaluation reports.

The case studies reported in chapters II, III, and IV of this report present parallel quantitative data for the SEA's and LEA's represented in the sample. Tabular data for the following characteristics are reported: (1) number of eligible children, (2) number of public school children participating in title I projects, (3) number of nonpublic-school children participating, (4) number of participants not enrolled in school, (5) the ratio between the total number classified as eligible and the total number of participants, (6) the expenditure per participant, (7) the rank of the educational agency in terms of its expenditure per participant, and (8) the expenditure rank of the SEA, based on one-half of the 1963–64 average per pupil expenditure in the State.

The information summarized in the tables was obtained from SEA evaluation reports, and from LEA project applications and evaluations. All data refer to fiscal year 1966. The research staff encountered a number of problems in attempting to assemble these descriptive data. In many instances, it was found that LEA evaluation forms were only partially completed. In others, there was difficulty in determining whether reported counts were unduplicated. The difference between funds authorized and funds actually expended on projects was not always readily ascertainable from the documents which were available to the staff. The enrollments projected in applications were in many cases substantially different from the number of participants reported in evaluations. The data in the tables of chapters II, III, IV are based, to the fullest degree possible, on the information contained in evaluations, rather than in the applications. While every reasonable effort was made to insure consistency of data for all the cases, in terms of documentary source and computational basis, the goal was not completely attainable. The data should be interpreted with that limitation in mind.

In the tables, the data for "Title I Expenditure Rank" and "State Expenditures (1963–64) Rank" indicate the ranking within the large, medium, or small LEA category, as well as the ranking within the total of 30 cases. Thus 6(22) indicates that the LEA ranked sixth in the appropriate category of 10 cases, and ranked 22d in the total set.

These rankings were utilized in the calculation of rank order correlation coefficients, which are reported in chapter V. The correlations were computed in order to study the relationships between such factors as the percent of non-public-school children participating and the expenditure per participant.

SAMPLE

The study includes 10 large school systems, 10 medium school systems, and 10 small school systems. A stratified random sampling technique has been utilized in the selection process. "Education Directory, 1964–65, Part 2: Public School Systems," published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Office of Education, lists the systematic kind of information necessary for the three-strata selection. Each of the 50 States was assigned to one of six regions by the USOE as follows:

Region I—New England and Middle Atlantic States:

Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia.

Region II—Southeast States:

Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi.

Region III—North Central States:

Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

Region IV—South Central and Southwest States:

Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, New Mexico, and Arizona.

Region V—Rocky Mountain States:

North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Nebraska, Utah, and Nevada.

Region VI—Far West States:

California, Oregon, Washington, Hawaii, and Alaska.

Large school systems (1 million plus to 36,000).—In the first section of the directory, the school systems were ranked by size of enrollment. Multiples of five were selected from the first 100 school systems. The names of these 20 school systems were listed, together with the names of the respective State. Each system was placed into its appropriate region. Since the sampling procedure required that 10 large school systems be chosen exclusive of repetition of State and region, the following selection was made: Two systems were chosen from regions I, II, III, VI, and one system from regions IV and V. The latter two regions originally contained fewer States.

Medium school systems (36,000 to 10,000).—The same technique applied here. Two systems were selected from regions I, II, III, V, and one system from regions IV and VI. The interchange of numbers of systems selected from regions V and VI was necessary because only one system, at this time, remained in region VI. It was previously decided that Hawaii and Alaska, due to excessive distance, should be eliminated from consideration.

Small school systems (10,000 or less).—At this point in the selection process 20 States had been chosen. The remaining States were assigned to their respective regions. Region I, six States; region II, six States; region III, four States; region IV, five States; and region V, seven States. The States in region VI had been selected or excluded in previous sampling. School systems from the middle and last States (of the alphabetical list of States) were selected from each of the remaining regions. The multiple-of-five technique was applied at this point.

From the list of systems ranked by size of enrollment, the 10 small school systems were chosen.

The remaining chapters in this report include case studies of the 10 large school systems (ch. II), case studies of the 10 medium-size school systems (ch. III), and case studies of the 10 small school systems (ch. IV). Chapter V contains the analysis of findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

PERSONNEL

The staff core consists of a project administrator, Dr. Vincent C. Nuccio; a research director, Dr. John J. Walsh; a research associate; two research assistants; and a full-time secretary. Fourteen field survey coordinators listed in the front of this report were selected from the faculties of public and private universities throughout the United States.

Due to the professional status, the geographic and institutional representation of the group of field survey coordinators, an advisory committee was deemed unnecessary. Additional resource consultants have been utilized as needed.

TIME—WORK SCHEDULE FOR PHASE I

On November 10, 1966, the letters announcing the Boston College project were mailed to the chief State school officers and carbon copies to the State title I directors by the U.S. Office of Education.

On November 14, 1966, the project letters were mailed from Boston College to the diocesan superintendents of schools and to the State title I directors.

In both letters, the school district selected in the sample was identified, and the field survey coordinators for that area were introduced.

On November 16, 1966, a project letter was sent to the field survey coordinators. They were informed of the letter from the U.S. Office of Education to the chief State school officers. Carbons of the followup letters were enclosed together with a form for small contract proposals and expense account forms. The field survey coordinators were informed that they were free to contact personnel at the State level and at the LEA and to procure application forms (1965–66 and 1966–67) and evaluation for these projects.

During the month of December, the field survey coordinators transmitted to the Boston College staff all materials gathered up to this date, including copies of application forms and State evaluation forms, and any other available information together with appropriate comments pertaining to the questionnaires received at the Boston College meeting on October 14, 1966. The suggestion of the U.S. Office of Education that the staff should perform all the clerical work and organize a profile of the title I community from available sources was adopted.

December 5 to January 4, 1967, the Boston College staff constructed the final form of the instruments.

December 15, 1966, reported to the U.S. Office of Education the specific objectives and worktime schedule for phase I together with a tentative set of objectives and worktime schedule for phase II.

January 5 to March 1, 1967, the field survey coordinators received the revised instruments and intensive fieldwork occurred during this timespan. Staff members were available for consultation with the field survey coordinators at the AACTE and AERA conferences in Chicago and New York, respectively, during this period.

March 1 was the deadline for submitting proposals to the project director for companion in-depth studies. These will be screened by the staff, then forwarded to the U.S. Office of Education for an information and recommendation review.

March 2 to May 1, 1967, the project staff analyzed the findings reported by the field survey coordinators.

April 15, 1967, the Boston College project submitted to the U.S. Office of Education a request for funds for the second fiscal year of the existing contract.

May 2 to June 30, 1967, case studies were prepared and the final report of phase I of the title I Boston College study was written for submission to the U.S. Office of Education.

June 1967, funds were awarded for three special, in-depth, companion studies.

CHAPTER II

CASE STUDIES—LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS

ESEA title I activities involving participation of non-public-school children in 10 large school systems—districts enrolling more than 36,000 students—are described in this chapter. Each of the 10 districts is in a different State. The geographic distribution is as follows: One Northeastern State, one Midwestern State, one Southeastern State, two Southern States, two North Central States, one Eastern State, and two west coast States. The subsequent chapters will contain descriptions of title I involvement of non-public-school children living in the attendance areas of 10 medium school systems—districts enrolling from 10,000 to 36,000 students—and 10 small school systems—districts enrolling less than 10,000 students.

Information for these 30 case studies has been obtained from various sources: (1) ESEA State interim reports of title I activities as of December 1965, (2) fiscal year 1966 LEA title I project applications, (3) fiscal year 1966 SEA and LEA title I evaluation reports, (4) fiscal year 1967 LEA title I project applications, (5) diocesan school bulletins, newsletters, and similar publications, (6) interview narratives written by field survey coordinators after they had visited each State title I director, regional director of Government programs in nonpublic school systems, LEA title I coordinator, principal of a public school or of a nonpublic school involved in title I activities, and interested citizens at the local level, and (7) pertinent publications from the U.S. Office of Education, and from hearings before the congressional Subcommittee on Education prior to the enactment of ESEA of 1965.

The first part of each case study is a brief description of State characteristics. Included in this description is a summary of the fiscal year 1966 title I State maximum basic grant together with a table of basic data concerning fiscal year 1966 participation in title I projects. The portion of the State constitution which deals with public aid to nonpublic schools is examined in order to better understand the framework within which this Federal law functions. Initial efforts of officials at the State department of education to involve regional directors of nonpublic schools in the orientation to title I are reviewed.

The second part of each case study contains a description of the local administrative unit of the public school system. There are some instances where local school districts are coterminous with the county intermediate unit. Maximum basic grants for the county and for the local school district for fiscal year 1966 are mentioned. LEA data for the same period of time are summarized in the table. A composite picture of title I involvement of eligible non-public-school children is drawn from sources previously mentioned. Since the needs of eligible non-public-school children can only be communicated through their respective school officials, special attention was focused on involvement of non-public-school personnel in title I orientation sessions, in the planning of projects, in the operation and implementation of approved programs, and in the evaluation of projects. Recommendations from both sectors for more equitable sharing by eligible non-public-school children are included in this section.

CASE L–1

I. STATE CHARACTERISTIC

Case L–1 is a large city school system located in an Eastern State. The maximum basic grant for fiscal year 1966 was $55,941,428.28. Half the State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963–64 amounted to $237.39.

TABLE 1.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L–1*

Number of children eligible	235,652
Number of public-school children participating	248,359
Number of non-public-school children participating	60,367
Number of nonschool participants	4,710
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.30
Expenditure per participant	$178.94
Title I expenditure rank	2(4)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	5(13)

Constitutional and statutory provisions state that no appropriation shall be made to any charitable or educational institution not under the absolute control of the State except by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each house. A statute authorizes a district to provide free bus transportation only of public school pupils. Article 10 reads as follows:

> No money raised for the support of the public schools of the State shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian schools * * * Any school established and controlled by a sect, which teaches or propagates the peculiar or special doctrines of that sect, is a sectarian school.

In July 1966 the State effected a complete reorganization of school districts. This reorganization has seriously hampered efforts to secure certain data in the form and detail specified in Federal guidelines.

To expedite dissemination of initial information concerning the act, three meetings were held in the State department of education buildings. Non-public-school authorities and all LEA officials were invited. These meetings were followed by some 100 regional conferences. TV, the news media, films, filmstrips, brochures, and all other means of communications were used in order to disseminate information about the act, and in particular about title I.

Non-public-school officials had no part in the review and approval of projects at the State level. The Federal guidelines simply recommended that non-public-school officials endorse action at the State level. "In the first year, cooperation was a little difficult to achieve. This year it is much better. The State department followed guidelines very carefully and insisted that if there were no eligible non-public-school children, both parties had to so state this. Frequently, our policy caused LEA's to initiate contacts with dioceses," commented a State official. He also expressed belief that communication between public and non-public-school officials has vastly improved. Relationships have always been cordial and professional. Now there are frequent discussions of mutual problems and some cooperative planning of joint programs to help to solve these problems. "Parochial school people are well educated and highly competent people."

Lawsuits and legal involvement have caused delays and some problems at the operational level in establishing the ESEA title I program. The major lawsuit will be described at the local level of this study. One of the 67 counties did not want to be involved in Federal programs, and it refused to accept the $19,000 allotment. Six LEA's (less than 1 percent of all LEA's in the State) refused to participate.

Community action agencies exist in 64 counties of the State, each having a chairman and a board of directors. Two of these agencies attacked the title I program because all of their suggestions had not been included in certain projects.

According to a September 1965 publication, approximately 92 percent of the maximum allotment was spent in fiscal year 1966. Projects funded for fiscal year 1967 have already accounted for most of the maximum State allotment. An analysis of 820 title I projects submitted during fiscal year 1966 reveals a preponderance of reading and basic skills activities. An excerpt from the fiscal year 1966 SEA evaluation says:

> Public and non-public school officials have cooperated in a variety of ways to develop and implement projects. Generally, this cooperation has consisted of providing services and/or equipment to the non-public school locations. Field trip experiences appear to be a successful joint venture with transportation being furnished on an equal or joint basis. The problems concerned with developing or implementing public and non-public school projects appear to be of four general types: (1) Local bias, (2) Sects which do not believe in using federal funds for education, (3) Absence of non-public schools in some areas, (4) Sects which will not accept public education—only the limited teachings of their own culture.

The concluding paragraph from that section of the fiscal year 1966 SEA evaluation report is worthy of note:

> Legislated action is not a solution to the public and non-public school participation in cooperative educational activities. Cooperation, additional development and implementation of projects, accomplishment of objectives in cooperative ventures, and the time to adjust to each other's needs will accomplish more in this area than legislated dictates could ever accomplish.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The county and local school district are coterminous in this instance. This is not typical of the majority of other local administrative units in this State. Approximately 51,429 eligible children accounted for the authorization of $12,208,730.31 for this local school district.

TABLE 2.—*LEA data, case No. L-1*

Number of children eligible	51,429
Number of public school children participating	70,000
Number of nonpublic school children participating	6,000
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.48
Expenditure per participant	$160.52
Title I expenditure rank	6 (15)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	5 (13)

"We met a couple of times prior to funding. The LEA coordinator and I met every 2 or 3 weeks to discuss the priority of needs of eligible children under our jurisdiction. Top priorities were remedial reading services, speech therapy, and psychological services," commented the nonpublic school director of Government programs in this diocese. He felt that relationships between the two sectors in this LEA were most conducive to joint educational ventures. However, the situation in this community was not typical of the caliber of relationships existing between public and nonpublic school officials in other parts of the State.

From the LEA title I coordinator additional insights are gained:

> They (non-public schools) wanted and needed reading specialists and speech therapists. We submitted a remedial reading program but had difficulty finding personnel. We needed 100, but found only four. We discussed cooperative methods with diocesan level non-public school officials, but when it got to the local parish level, they refused to cooperate because the children would have to go to school with Negroes.

Fifteen of twenty-three fiscal year 1966 projects provided for the involvement of nonpublic school children in projects based in public schools.

The data contained in the fiscal year 1966 SEA and LEA evaluation reports and in eight interview narratives indicate that top officials of both public and nonpublic schools were involved in orientation and planning. A public school principal said:

> We were asked not to take the initiative in this matter (orientation and planning with nonpublic school personnel), perhaps at the request of the diocesan superintendent. Planning was done within our departments. We were told that some of our project staff (art, music, kindergarten) would be lost to us 1 day a week. Planning took place at levels higher than my level of responsibility. We had a summer school program for all teachers in project area schools where eligible children were enrolled. Due to inadequate communication, youngsters who enrolled did not always show up. They had not been notified of their acceptance in the programs. Only one nonpublic school principal shows strong interest. She phones me and has attended meetings here (public school building). We have been asked, at times, to get information about their (nonpublic schools) children. It was available to me.

Nonpublic school principals are in agreement with their public school colleagues:

> Local public school officials worked through the diocesan office. For the first time this year, I have been asked to come to meetings and make recommendations. Our personnel have attended title I inservice programs in reading and mathematics. Some of our faculty are still attending these inservice programs each semester.

Eligible children from both sectors are free to enroll in the summer programs. They may attend Saturday morning programs for the academically able, afterschool tutorial programs, and sewing classes in the evenings. State constitutional restrictions, limited space for dual enrollment in public schools, busing and scheduling problems, working mothers, shortage of specialists, bias and prejudice, and a highly competitive CYO program are factors most frequently related to minimal participation of nonpublic school children.

Gangs are a problem in this large city. Parents are reluctant to let the children to go to classes after dusk. A nonpublic school principal commented, "Youngsters dislike crossing racial neighborhood lines after dark. Puerto Rican parents are very protective of their children."

The nonpublic schools have the services for 1 day each week of an art teacher, a music teacher who gives organ lessons only (organs are on loan to these schools), a reading specialist, and an English teacher. In one school, the reading specialist spent 3 half-days per week.

Another loan of equipment included a TV set, two 16-millimeter filmstrip projectors, a movie projector, tape recorder, overhead projector, and an organ. A non-public-school principal commented:

> Our English-for-foreign-youngsters-teacher takes her materials and supplies with her. The public school youngsters get to keep their supplies and materials. It seems we are being discriminated against with regard to this matter. We are waiting for a screen and a case for filmstrips. We have a dry copier but we have to buy paper and other supplies in order to use the machine. I am trying to raise money to buy materials so we can use the equipment. Only 10 schools in the entire archdiocese were offered these machines, a poor ratio by comparison.

Many of the 220 school community coordinators spend one-half or a full day in the parochial schools. Afterschool speech improvement programs are held in public school buildings. Public school children go to a neighboring Presbyterian church for tutorial work. Title I funds enabled the public school officials to transport their children there.

In October 1966, the American Civil Liberties Union, Protestants and Other Americans for the Separation of Church and State, and the Jewish Community Relations Council filed a lawsuit against this large school system. A State official commented:

> The suit will likely be thrown out of court. We encouraged the LEA against whom the suit was brought to reexamine the children selected to participate in the art and music programs and in the special education project. A Spanish and French culture project, a part of the summer program, was brought under fire as well. The suit is rather poorly constructed and has no basis in fact. These people are against all Federal programs. They will use any excuse, including the church-state issue, to build a case. We really have nothing to worry about.

These pressure groups objected to the fact that public school teachers were teaching part time in the nonpublic schools. "We oppose any kind of aid to any sectarian schools," the executive of ACLU said, "but we do draw a distinction between health services or school lunches." In the meantime, the original arrangements of shared time and shared facilities continue until a ruling is handed down. One suit made it necessary for LEA officials to revise the music and art programs.

The court cases have caused some concern to people who read the newspapers. As knowledge spreads, concern will grow. Questions about the legality of the involvement of non-public-school children seemed to be increasing in this LEA.

A civil rights group has continually accused the white people of escaping to the parochial schools. There is a pressure group in favor of Catholic schools in this predominately Catholic city. They want their share. The Protestant element resents this pressure, and this has harmed good interschool relations.

This LEA has a very politically slanted board of education. Ever since the legal involvement and the threat of Washington to discontinue funding, public school officials have tended to become more cautious. Some sections of this community are very unfriendly and have a predominately negative attitude toward nonpublic schools.

"Administrative relationships are very much improved. We now work together and recognize one another's problems. The good attitudes at the top don't always filter down. In our situation there is good rapport with the nonpublic schools of our area. In general, this is so. I think that the parochial schools feel they have a better educational program and product, but I feel that this is not as accurate as they think. Their selection process for hiring teaching personnel is poor. Classes are too large. They have fewer facilities and less equipment than the public schools have. Their statistics are better because they are not required to keep youngsters," said one public school principal.

The LEA coordinator thought that some of the public school principals and some top administrators had stereotyped ideas with respect to the parochial schools. As a result of interaction, their attitudes have changed.

> Some of the teachers in the nonpublic schools of this area are very dedicated but not always well qualified. Some have little training beyond a high school diploma.

Another public school principal believes that the nonpublic schools have a good program; however, a number of their teachers are not certified. He admitted that he had tended to remain separate.

A non-public-school principal commented:

> My contacts with local public school people have been frequent and positive. The principal of the neighboring public school has been very cooperative. We have exchanged ideas. He calls frequently to pass on information or to make inquiries. We have attended meetings at his school. He and his staff have attended ours. I do not think that the public school community realizes the quality of education in the parochial schools. Some are shocked to learn that we teach more than religion.

Another non-public-school principal felt that there was more freedom between both groups.

> They are not so much in awe of us. We have a very fine public school nearby. They have invited the pastor and me for a meeting on the topic of human relations. We really do not know much about their educational programs. I think the climate is already conducive to joint projects.

The fiscal year 1966 LEA project evaluations were done by an outside professional agency. Principals of public and nonpublic schools were invited to meetings to discuss the values of ongoing projects. Questionnaires were also used as means of soliciting opinions about projects.

Test scores and other data on non-public-school children who participated in title I programs were forwarded to nonpublic schools. Non-public-school personnel think the token involvement of their children is only a beginning. Much more needs to be done.

Curriculum changes in reading, arithmetic, science, and creative writing have been made as a result of title I participation. More frequent and better use of audiovisual equipment has resulted from the inservice A–V training program.

The community must be better informed about title I. The intent of the law has been so poorly interpreted that the public is thoroughly confused. The parochial schools educate more than one-fourth of the children in this LEA, but their students have shared in half a million of the $11 million authorized for this district. This is obviously disproportionate, considering the fact that the nine high school and 52 elementary schools of the diocese are located in designated areas in this

LEA. The non-public-school director of government programs observes:

> I feel we are guilty of not pushing hard enough for our schools. I think this may come in time. Some of our people are rather passive and appreciate beyond reason the receipt of an overhead projector or other piece of equipment. If we want the aid, we have to accept the guidelines. The mere experience of the program will improve relationships between systems, groups, and individuals. Eventually they (public school officials) may come to see that improving educational opportunities for all benefits the community. The administrative time and money involved in soliciting benefits must be removed. These obstacles impede the initiative of non-public-school officials.

A public school principal recommended that a learning center be provided in the parochial school. He deplored the lack of uniformity of interpretation of laws.

> This is a real knotty problem. It would be an advantage if they (non-public-school children) could come to our school during the regular school day. Somehow we have got to break down this fear of one another.

Interested citizens active in community programs agreed that all eligible children should be served by title I provided the guidelines are closely observed.

One added:

> I am opposed to the Government, in any way, directly or indirectly, providing aid to any parochial schools. I would like to see them close the Catholic schools so the kids can integrate religiously and racially.

Another recommended a greater number of dual enrollment programs. This, she believed, would require an extensive public relations program in order to orient the parents of both sectors.

CASE L-2

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This case describes a large school system in a Northeastern State. The maximum amount authorized to the State under title I in fiscal year 1966 was $109,639.84. This figure was based on one-half the State average per pupil expenditures for 1963-64 of $265.64.

In fiscal year 1966 at least 95 percent of the title I funds was expended. The field survey coordinator was informed that in fiscal year 1967, "it will probably be as high or higher."

TABLE 3.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L-2*

Number of children eligible	299, 856
Number of public school children participating	751, 418
Number of non-public-school children participating	108, 063
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:2. 87
Expenditure per participant	$127. 56
Title I expenditure	7(15)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	1(1)

Private and parochial school administrators were advised of all regional meetings dealing with ESEA and were placed on the State department of education mailing lists so that they might receive all publications.

Of the more than 200 LEA's which participated in cooperative projects with nonpublic schools, all met with at least some degree of success, but about half of these schools encountered problems. The most common difficulty was insufficient data on non-public-school pupils. Other problems included communication difficulties, deficiencies in planning, and uncertainty in ascertaining which children were educationally disadvantaged.

The SEA maintained, in accordance with the Federal guidelines, that the participation of educationally deprived non-public-school children in target areas in title I must be substantially comparable to that of children enrolled in public schools. Also, it was insisted that non-public-school officials be involved in the overall planning of the local title I program.

Under State law dual enrollment and shared time are not permissible. The State constitution does restrict the use of title I funds to aid non-public-school children.

When title I was initially implemented, the Attorney General rendered a series of opinions. The SEA title I director explained, however, that "most judgments are made by our legal staff."

In this State a number of lawsuits have been initiated to test the legality of various title I programs.

The SEA "office personnel" were responsible for the review and approval of fiscal year 1966 applications. All applications go through the same procedure, and the differences are resolved through joint meetings of the various divisions. In many cases, outside consultants are engaged.

Non-public-school officials were not invited by the SEA to review or endorse applications prior to approval, but the SEA title I director explained, "We do not approve a project unless there is evidence of the involvement of nonpublic schools." To the SEA, the only legitimate reason for the exclusion of nonpublic children from a title I project was if there were no educationally disadvantaged children in the nonpublic schools in that area.

The relationship between the SEA and high-level non-public-school officials was described by the title I director as "excellent." As a result of title I programs, the relationship has been expanded, particularly in terms of communication and coordination. The title director perceived "a great deal of evidence of mutual understanding, and it appears to be growing most at the local level, where it tended to be uneven."

The director of special projects for the diocese felt that the relationship between the SEA and non-public-school officials "left something to be desired" prior to title I. There was lack of communication resulting in a lack of cooperation. Since title I, "our relationships have improved a great deal." It was his opinion that "the nonpublic sector was primarily responsible" for communication between the public and nonpublic sectors, that it was "very good," but "recently it has slackened off a bit probably due to oversight." As a result, "communication is about as it was prior to title I."

The diocesan director offered the following suggestions:

(a) A liaison person from the Catholic school system in the public schools to act as a bridge to communications;

(*b*) Greater coordination and communication with the nonpublic schools as to the details of the various projects needed;

(*c*) Greater freedom for nonpublic schools to determine the nature of programs which will deal primarily with non-public-school children; and

(*d*) Further clarification of what is and is not possible under the State law.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

This LEA is one of 29 local school districts in the county. However, this large LEA received about half of the county grant because it enrolls the greatest number of needy children. A total of 19,212 eligible children in the county accounted for all maximum grant of $7,024,675.68.

TABLE 4.—*LEA data, case No. L-2*

Number of children eligible	16, 861
Number of public school children participating	24, 000
Number of non-public-school children participating	8, 000
Number of nonschool participants	2, 000
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:2. 02
Expenditure per participant	$131. 76
Title I expenditure rank	8 (21)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	1 (1)

The intent of the title I program was to provide the additional staff necessary to insure that each elementary school child in the public and private schools of the target area would receive adequate exposure to remedial work in reading and in mathematics. Additional speech teachers were engaged to cooperate with the classroom teacher in improving children's expressional abilities. Extensive field trips, after-school enrichment programs including programs in the arts, music, industrial arts, and physical education and evening activities were also part of the program.

The estimated number of children in the target area of the LEA under consideration was 27,900. They were distributed in 27 public and nonpublic schools. The children were drawn from the core of the city which is distinguished by the high proportion of educationally deprived children.

The title I programs began in February 1966 and ended in June 1966. The title I summer program began in June 1966 and ended in August 1967.

The summer program was designed to meet the needs of educationally deprived children in grades 1–12. Emphasis was placed on raising achievement and aspiration levels of children from the target area.

Non-public-school personnel had direct contact with public school officials. Several meetings were conducted by the director of special projects for the public schools, and non-public-school personnel were involved in every meeting. The diocesan director was constantly consulted in the planning of projects and the inservice programs. A great deal of interest in title I was displayed by non-public-school officials.

Non-public-school officials were involved in the planning of title I projects to a degree, but not as fully as we would have preferred. The diocesan director of special projects explained that for every proposal from the public schools, there was a representative from the nonpublic schools as a member of each committee. Particularly in the enrichment and remediation program, a non-public-school principal explained that non-public-school personnel were consulted as to the special needs of non-public-school students and they participated in discussions about what was to be done. The diocesan director indicated some limitations to the participation of non-public-school personnel in the planning phase, and stated that, "some projects were conceived and presented to us by the public schools. It would be an improvement if we were included in the generation of ideas also."

The LEA sought and received information about non-public-school children in preparing applications. Non-public-school-teaching personnel were included in the inservice program, one for every three public school personnel.

The participation of the Catholic school children has remained high in the second year of the program, with a greater involvement and enthusiasm on the part of the non-public-school children and teachers.

The only problem encountered in scheduling project activities to suit non-public-school students was the State law which stipulates that public school facilities be used first, if it is possible to do so. Thus, the afterschool programs are all held in public facilities.

The appeal of the programs to parents is one factor which encourages substantial participation by non-public-school children. Things seem to go best when there is direct contact with the school principals. Poor participation is related to a lack of this direct communication. In some areas, some parents of non-public-school children apparently send their children to nonpublic schools to avoid contact with Negro children.

All activities which were conducted in the public schools were also offered in the nonpublic schools with the exception of the afterschool programs. All personnel were essentially duplicated with a great variety of specialized personnel services available to non-public-school children (for example, a remedial reading teacher, school psychologist, social worker, attendance officer, teacher aides, visiting teachers, et cetera).

The administrative personnel in the schools were responsible for running the programs in their schools. Generally, people were not assigned, but were pooled, many of them circulating among several schools.

There has been no difference in the operations between fiscal year 1966 and 1967. However, there was more time for planning and communication with the nonpublic schools.

The climate of cooperation between public and nonpublic school officials prior to title I was very good. At the higher level of administration, there was an indication of more cooperation than at the principal's level. Since title I, the climate has remained good and the programs have opened up channels of communications that did not exist before title I.

With title I, the public sector has been given a greater awareness of what the parochial schools are doing, and they have come to understand some of our problems. Contact between the public and nonpublic schools takes place frequently and proves to be valuable.

Non-public-school personnel cooperated in gathering test data and administering questionnaires in their schools. They essentially handled their end of all projects. They were not involved in the coordination or planning of evaluation procedures. Non-public-school personnel did not review the project evaluation reports, nor did they receive copies of the evaluations sent to the SEA. They did receive copies of the individual project reports pertaining to participants from their schools.

Evaluation procedures have remained essentially the same for fiscal year 1967.

There has been some change in the educational practice of the nonpublic schools as a result of title I. The testing program has been developed and standardized. A few schools have adopted a nongraded approach. There is a greater use of audiovisual materials, and more individual attention is now possible through the use of teacher aides.

The State constitution has made the distribution of some materials difficult and complicated. It would simplify matters considerably if this provision is changed or clarified.

A major problem centers on prejudice in terms of race and occasionally in terms of nationality. This tends to lower Catholic schoolchildren's participation in projects conducted in areas with a large Negro population.

CASE NO. L-3

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This is a southeastern State, consisting of 67 counties, all of which were eligible for ESEA title I funds. The maximum State allocation for fiscal year 1966 was $27,478,937.07, computed on a figure of $192.79, half of the State average expenditure per pupil for 1963-64. The basic description data for the State are summarized in table 5.

TABLE 5.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L-3*

Number of children eligible	142,533
Number of public school children participating	167,338
Number of non-public-school children participating	2,434
Number of nonschool participants	502
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.20
Expenditure per participant	$161.38
Title I expenditure rank	4 (9)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	9 (20)

The State constitution prohibits the use of public funds for the support of sectarian schools. Statutory provisions prohibit the use of public funds for the transportation of private school children.

> The philosophical intent of title I of Public Law 89-10, section 205(a)(2) * * * has been accomplished to the extent possible within the framework of State statutes regarding the use of public funds for non-public-school students (taken from fiscal year 1966 State evaluation).

The establishment of dialog between public and nonpublic school administrators with regard to ESEA title I was initiated by the State department of education in June 1965 when non-public-school personnel were invited to joint meetings and conferences. State department officials suggested at this time that non-public-school representatives be appointed to LEA advisory committees, that non-public-school officials be briefed and informed about title I activities, and that nonpublic-school administrators be invited to assist in making arrangements for non-public-school students to participate in approved projects.

In order to insure frequent and more satisfactory communication between the SEA and the LEA, an intermediate post, that of regional liaison director, was created. Each regional director is responsible for one of six regions into which the State has been divided. "This may explain, in part, the limited communication, by correspondence exclusively, between the diocesan superintendent and the SEA director of title I. The State agency seems convinced that the nonpublic segment is properly grateful for title I assistance," remarked a State official during an interview with a field survey coordinator. The State department of education, through the regional directors, focused attention on the importance of local administrative initiative in contacting nonpublic-school officials.

"There has been no litigation generated by title I. The advent of title I and similar programs has initiated a dialog between public and nonpublic school administrators which augurs well for the future. There appears to have been no appreciable opposition to the involvement of the parochial school element in the program," answered a title I State supervisor to the question of possible legal involvement.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

In this State the boundary of a school district is identical with that of the county. The county included in our study is located in the extreme northeastern part of the State. In fiscal year 1966, $2,468,675.95 was allocated as the maximum local grant. Approximately 96 percent of this amount was expended. For fiscal year 1967, $2,392,809 has been authorized for approved projects. Basic descriptive data for the local school agency are summarized in table 6.

TABLE 6.—*LEA data, case No. L–3*

Number of children eligible	12, 805
Number of public school children participating	15, 927
Number of non-public-school children participating	288
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1: 1. 27
Expenditure per participant	$146. 16
Title I expenditure rank	7 (18)
State expenditure (1963–65) rank	9 (20)

The LEA coordinator is a retired military officer. The military philosophy of organization and management is much in evidence. At the time of the field survey coordinator's visit to the LEA, the project directors were called into a special meeting. Each reported on his project, generally and specifically, with regard to nonpublic involvement. "From these reports it seems clear that the non-public-school children have benefited principally from the reading programs. Eligible children from the two nonpublic schools have visited the reading laboratory and have had speech and hearing diagnoses. The reading specialist has visited and has taught remedial classes in two parochial schools. The staff working with the mental health project will accept referrals for diagnosis." All projects originate with the central office staff, with some involvement of public school principals and teachers.

Non-public-school personnel do not participate in planning or evaluation. They are informed of approved projects and are urged to participate; however, transportation and scheduling difficulties prevented eligible non-public-school children from participating in seven of the nine approved projects. Judging from a description of the fiscal year 1967 program, limited participation is again restricted to remedial reading programs and health services. Summer programs are open to all.

The LEA coordinator believes that title I legislation "delineates limited involvement of non-public-school children." He thinks that present guidelines from USOE prevent aid from reaching youngsters who need help, and that more stable funding—not restricted to a 30-day period—would enhance the effectiveness of the program. He is willing to make available certain materials and services and believes that the latter should be rendered on non-public-school grounds. He describes himself as, "leaning over backwards," to help the parochial schools.

In reality some discrepancies exist. A project funded for the 6-week summer session of 1967 will enable 300 teachers from project schools to receive special training at a State university. They will earn six trimester hours of undergraduate or graduate credits. The budget of the approved project is $298,157, which includes $75 per week stipend, tuition, $25 book allowance per participant. "Parochial school staffs are welcome to audit but naturally cannot be granted stipends," the LEA coordinator reported during the interview.

A nun is one of the diocesean school supervisors of elementary education. She has the additional responsibility of coordinating title I activities in this region. She has had very little contact with the State agency except through the regional liaison director of title I. Because Sister was attending the NCEA convention at the time of the interview a lay woman, the diocesan liaison between the diocese and the LEA, agreed to discuss non-public-school involvement. Even though she worked closely with the LEA staff, she did not participate in the planning or evaluation sessions. She appeared resigned to settle for an "occasional crust of bread," and feared that if she "rocked the boat" too much, the non-public-school children would lose the small benefits they were currently getting. In this county, only two diocesan schools are benefiting from ESEA title I activities.

The principal of one of nonpublic schools receiving title I assistance reported that her school was selected "through a blind stab at names of private schools listed in the phone book." The reading specialist helped eligible second graders in the non-public-school building. This arrangement was credited to the project director who insisted on helping all children who need it. Results of referrals to the reading laboratory took, at times, 3 months to reach the schools. She expressed much concern about the gap between the very careful briefings about approved projects, available aid, et cetera, and the difficulty of obtaining services and equipment.

The county staff worked diligently to write projects for eligible kindergarten youngsters, for cataloging educational media received under Federal grants, for development of audiovisual and printed resource materials and services, for in-school identification and remediation of emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted children in school attendance areas having a high concentration of economically deprived children, for inservice training of teachers, for improving reading ability of second graders in deprived areas, and for deaf and severely hard-of-hearing children in economically deprived areas.

In general, non-public-school educators working in economically deprived areas were disturbed and disappointed that the favorable communications with the LEA did not result in the loan of equipment and materials from the resource center or in equal opportunity to participate in inservice programs. Through recent correspondence, the LEA executive assistant said that it was permissible for LEA to lend equipment purchased with title I funds to nonpublic schools enrolling students eligible for title I funds. Title to the property is retained by the LEA.

Attitudes and opinions were also solicited from interested citizens. Mr. X of the OEO staff described the relationship between his office and the LEA as cooperative and congenial in caring for the prekindergarten and kindergarten children. The OEO control office is located in a convent leased by the bishop for a dollar a year. This is indicative of cordial relations between the public and parochial sectors.

A journalist who reports educational matters in the large city newspaper indicated that "there appeared to be some community feeling about ESEA title I matters. However, people in the community seemed willing to submerge those concerns in favor of improving educational opportunities for our children." He was unable to comment significantly on the involvement of non-public-school children.

The chairman of the county board of education believes in segregation and in States rights. Recognizing that the county cannot take care of its own economically deprived children, he will accept any outside help he can get. Since he himself cherished fiscal efficiency, his prejudice against Federal aid is mitigated because LEA officials are doing an excellent job.

CASE L-4

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case L-4 is based on a large school district, the only LEA in the county. All 95 counties of this central Southern State were eligible for title I funds. The maximum State allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $32,206,225.28. Approximately 92 percent of this amount was actually committed for funded projects. One-half of the State average current expenditure per pupil amounted to $146.36.

TABLE 7.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L-4*

Number of children eligible	220,048
Number of public school children participating	240,619
Number of non-public-school children participating	1,007
Number of nonschool participants	2,100
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.11
Expenditure per participant	$121.57
Title I expenditure rank	8(16)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	10(29)

A State constitutional provision authorizes public resources for private purpose with the concurrence of three-fourths of the votes cast at the county, city, or town election. Section 49–2202 provides that all pupils in a county shall be furnished equal opportunity to attend schools with transportation provided at public expense.

The State department of education is charged with regulatory and leadership responsibilities to 152 local school districts. With the advent of ESEA of 1965, the assistant State commissioner was named the acting State title I director. Outside professional consultant services were sought in order to structure activities designed to prepare local school personnel for participation in title I. The director and his staff undertook an intensive study of the Federal act and guidelines before attempting to develop State guidelines of various kinds. These were ready in the fall of 1965. During November, in various areas of the State, five regional clinics, each lasting a full day, were conducted by the SEA. All school systems were represented. Participant reactions were generally favorable.

During the first half of 1966, a full-time State title I director and 22 staff members were hired to work on title I at the State level.

The State commissioner of education, acting upon the advice of his staff, made final decisions about funding projects for fiscal year 1966. The SEA required each LEA title I applicant to furnish evidence that the LEA title I coordinator had contacted non-public-school officials, had acquainted them with the content of the proposed title I program, and had extended to the non-public-school officials the opportunity to participate in title I programs. In the event that the LEA district did not include any nonpublic schools, a statement to that effect was to be sent by the LEA to SEA.

During fiscal year 1966, private schools participated in 18 of the 352 funded projects. According to the fiscal year 1966 SEA evaluation, there appeared to be some reluctance by both sectors to launch into cooperative programs without thorough study of the implications. The late appropriations by Congress and the urgency for submitting projects for approval did not provide sufficient time for such a study. It should be noted that no problems of communications or misunderstanding between the two agencies developed. On the contrary, climate for cooperative planning seemed to be favorable.

A section of the fiscal year 1966 LEA evaluation report considered the question of non-public-school participation. Of the 152 LEA's in the State, 68 percent chose not to comment about legislative changes governing non-public-school participation in title I programs. Of the 32 percent responding, 1.3 percent recommended increased non-public-school children's participation, 2.7 percent recommended no revision of title I legislation, 2.0 percent recommended a reduction in non-public-school participation, 13.3 percent recommended separate and distinct legislation for public and nonpublic schools, and 12.7 percent recommended exclusion of non-public-school children from participation in public school activities. Moreover, 81 percent of those responding held strong opinions against the integration of public and non-public-school children. This attitude was articulated by a minority of school officials operating programs in small LEA's, representing only a small percentage of public schools in the State.

Although the diocesan and State geographical boundaries are the same, the diocesan superintendent has appointed several assistants who have charge of school affairs in certain sections of the State. The assistant in charge of the geographic area under consideration, in this case is also principal of a nonpublic high school. In his judgment, public school officials at the State and local levels have been very honest, cooperative, and willing to involve nonpublic school personnel in title I activities. He was invited to numerous meetings and regional clinics. Prior to title I there were few contacts between the two sectors at the State level. Now it is not unusual for the State commissioner to call non-public-school officials in order to discuss various aspects of ESEA and other educational matters. The extent of non-public-school involvement in title I projects depends, in most instances, on the good will of the public school officials.

The State title I director said there were no instances of approved applications which did not include non-public-school children. The field survey coordinator believed there was sufficient evidence to conclude that there is mutual understanding of and respect for one another's educational system and teaching personnel.

The legality of the act has not been challenged. There have been no pressure groups. Although a few LEA's did not participate, the church-state issue was not the reason. They simply chose not to apply.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

This large school system, the only public school system in the county, identified 10,146 eligible children and was alloted $1,484,968.56 in fiscal year 1966 and 85 percent of fiscal year 1966 was authorized for fiscal year 1967. Forty-six schools, included in the current project area, comprise roughly one-third of the LEA. For the various projects, the percentage of children from low-income families ranged from 11 to 80 percent.

TABLE 8.—*LEA data, case No. L–4*

Number of children eligible	10, 146
Number of public school children participating	30, 587
Number of non-public-school children participating	1, 000
Number of nonschool participants	500
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:3. 19
Expenditure per participant	$47
Title I expenditure rank	10(29)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	10(29)

In fiscal year 1966, nine projects were funded: (1) Improvement of the physical well-being of deprived children in the elementary and secondary schools. Free lunches were supplied. Health textbooks and health instruction were provided. Ten additional physical education teachers were hired. The LEA fiscal year 1966 evaluation noted, non-public-school children did not participate in the activities of this project. Correspondence from the LEA coordinator to the non-public-school assistant superintendent states:

> Our earlier communications with you concerning the services to be provided through this project led us to make provisions for eligible children in your schools only in the matter of health textbooks in grades 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8. As soon as possible you will please get in touch with us when you desire to borrow these books.

(2) This project was concerned with outdoor education at the elementary level. Private schools in the project area will be informed of the project and may participate if they wish to do so. The fiscal year 1966 LEA evaluation report indicated that non-public-school children did not participate. Reasons are not listed. One non-public-school teacher mentioned that parents of eligible children claim that their children do not need this assistance.

(3) A project to provide materials and train teachers to meet the educational needs of underachievers at the junior high level. According to the fiscal year 1966 LEA evaluation, non-public-school children did not participate.

(4) Diagnostic individualized approach to educational provisions for educationally deprived children. Non-public-school children did not participate.

(5) Inservice education for teachers of educationally deprived children. Six hundred teachers from target area schools attended a 6-week summer session. Four teachers from the parochial system and six from other nonpublic schools were included in this project.

(6) Improvement of education in elementary schools. Non-public-school children were unable to participate during the regular school day. Some took advantage of the occasional Saturday classes.

(7) Development of the art of creative living. A number of eligible pupils and/or teachers in private schools within the project area availed themselves of the opportunities provided in this project.

(8) Developmental reading designed to meet the needs of educationally deprived (grades 7–12). Non-public-school children did not participate.

(9) Reduction of pupil-teacher ratio, increased administrative, consultant, and library services. No special arrangements will be made with private schools in this regard due to the fact that the project is highly specific and by nature of the project any possibility of participation by private schools is impossible; however, the private schools will be informed of this project, as outlined in our comprehensive program. In fiscal year 1967, two additional projects and continuation of the nine listed above were approved.

"The willingness of public school officials to involve non-public-school officials in title I programs of this LEA was tremendous," commented a non-public-school official. He was the liaison person between the LEA and the non-public-school principals who administered schools enrolling a number of eligible children. He and the president of a private institute helped to identify target areas and to plan subsequent projects. Available information fails to indicate the degree of need existing in the nonpublic schools.

The LEA coordinator sent advance notices of all project-planning meetings to the non-public-school principals. Many attended and they helped to determine the final foci of all projects. He requested appropriate data on eligible non-public-school children and these were always made available.

No summer projects have been planned for eligible children during fiscal year 1967. The 2-week day camp experience in the summer of 1966 provided for some 193 eligible children. Limited funding may account for failure to provide for summer enrichment and/or remedial programs.

Public school officials believe that the private-school personnel are doing an excellent job with the resources at their command, but sense that they are able to meet the needs of only certain groups of students. The non-public-school officials respect the competency of the staff and the quality of the educational program of the public schools. Formal and informal dialogue has increased. The frequency of communication can best be described as limited, but is considered valuable by both sides. The multiplicity of administrative responsibilities assumed by non-public-school officials curtails the amount of time which could be spent on public relations.

Both sectors agree that involvement of non-public-school children in title I definitely serves the educational needs of the community. However, great care, stressed the LEA coordinator, must be taken in administering the program because of the church-state issue. He also expressed serious reservations about financing private education with public funds. No pressure groups or legal involvements on this issue have appeared. The likelihood of future litigation is decreasing.

Non-public-school officials were asked to comment on the success or lack of success of fiscal year 1966 projects. They were not involved in writing the evaluation which was sent to the State department, but they reviewed the completed form and received copies of the same.

Discernible changes in reading were encouraging. The in-service program for teachers who staff schools in the target area was credited with a curriculum change most frequently mentioned; namely, the nongraded-reading program which has been introduced at several schools in the target area. The cultural program afforded eligible high school students an opportunity to experience wholesome leisure-time activities.

There appears to be a need for projects which would provide training of specialists in the areas of remedial reading and arithmetic, guidance and counseling, and mental retardation. Among the recommendations elicited by the field survey coordinator were these: Future funds should be appropriated in the spring; additional visual aids, materials and equipment, and demonstration of the use of them are needed by both sectors; and the non-public-school regional assistant superintendent should involve more non-public-school principals in the decisionmaking process.

There was also a feeling the LEA coordinator could be more aggressive in publicizing and promoting the title I program, and that attempts should be made to overcome the problems of shared time. Summer-school projects should be planned for eligible students, and a program designed to promote readiness for school is urgently needed.

The State constitutional and statutory provisions permit a great deal of assistance to nonpublic schools. The communication and dialog between the two sectors have the potential of establishing an ideal climate for action. In reality, participation is guarded by the fear of violating the first and 14th amendments of the Constitution of the United States. Revised ESEA title I legislation could pave the way for more and better participation of non-public-school children in funded projects.

CASE L-5

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This State is located in the North Midwest section of the United States. The LEA involved in this case is a large school system situated in the central part of the State.

The maximum amount authorized for this State for fiscal year 1966 under title I was $39,094,561, of which $34,094,561 was actually committed. One-half State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963–4 was $220.93.

TABLE 9.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L-5*

Number of children eligible	177,367
Number of public-school children participating	205,814
Number of non-public-school children participating	16,127
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.25
Expenditure per participant	$153.62
Title I expenditure rank	5 (11)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	6 (16)

The State evaluation report for fiscal year 1966 states that, before the advent of the title I program, State personnel had open channels of communication with non-tax-supported schools in the State.

In regard to the relationship of tax-supported schools to non-tax-supported schools, the State revised code (3301.07, D.) states:

> In the formulation and administration of such standards for non-tax-supported schools, the board shall also consider the particular needs, methods, and objectives of such schools, provided they do not conflict with the provision of a general education of a high quality and provided that regular procedures shall be followed for promotion from grade to grade of pupils who have met the educational requirements prescribed.

When the title I program was implemented, existing lines of communication were utilized and new ones were opened. One of the first steps taken was to inform non-tax-supported schools of current legislation and guidelines. Non-tax-supported school officials were placed on the SEA's title I mailing list. Representatives of non-tax-supported schools were invited to all statewide title I conferences as participants and/or consultants.

The State interim report says that all school districts were advised to contact officials of private schools in their districts.

When proposals were submitted for title I projects, each proposal was screened by title I staff members—a staff maintained by the State department of education—to determine the number of non-tax-supported school students who were to be involved in the project. If no non-tax-supported students were to be involved, the local school district was expected to show the cause for exclusion. Three of the most common reasons for not including non-tax-supported school students were:

1. No non-tax-supported school students reside in the school attendance area;
2. The non-tax-supported school students in the attendance area do not meet the selection criteria; and

3. Non-tax-supported school officials do not wish to participate.

Other factors tend to distort the number and percentage of non-tax-supported school participation. These factors deal with the grade level of project students. Many projects were directed at preschool children. In these projects it is impossible to determine whether or not the participants were to be classified as tax-supported school students. Some non-tax-supported school systems do not have kindergartens or first grades; others do not have junior high schools or high schools. These are some of the factors which limited the possible participation of students from non-tax-supported schools.

Projects involving non-public-school children's participation have produced no significant changes in the existing relationship among school systems. Title I programs have not engendered directional shifts in the relationships between public and nonpublic schools because, over the years, there has been a general and gradually increasing spirit of cooperation. For the same reasons, increased interaction and communication, there have been no outstanding problems.

Some problems have occurred, however. The initial misunderstanding of the intent and purpose of the legislation on the part of some non-tax-supported, school leaders has now largely been resolved. Other problems, involving identification of students' needs, dissimilar methods of recordkeeping, and scheduling of services are being analyzed.

Joint discussions of cooperative projects have made school leaders from both tax-supported and non-tax-supported school systems aware of each other's problems.

In some rural areas of the State, certain religious denominations have decided not to participate in title I programs, but a large number of students was not involved. The vast majority of public-school leaders who completed project evaluation reports expressed no strong sentiment concerning their relation with non-tax-supported schools.

The State director of title I reports that, while relationships between the State department of education and non-public-school officials have been good, they seem to have become stronger subsequent to title I involvement. He says that the State department has invited non-public-school officials to planning and information dissemination meetings and non-public-school officials have made presentations at such meetings. He reports that communication has been initiated by the public sector, but response and cooperation from the private sector has been good.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools reports that he attended a series of meetings with local public-school personnel to discuss how non-public-school children would be involved in title I programs. He reports that public-school personnel were willing to cooperate but feels that in most cases he had to make requests. In his words, public-school people did not come to him very often. He reports that communications between the public and nonpublic sectors are very good and the climate for cooperation seems to be quite good. He reports that there were no legal implications.

The State department of education does not feel that pressure groups are attempting to exert influence either to include or exclude non-public-school children. Some eligible LEA's did not participate in title I. The reasons for nonparticipation revolve around staffing and other resource problems, not because of reactions to the church-state and/or Federal versus local control questions.

It appears that there is mutual understanding between the public- and non-public-school officials. One reason for this may be the fact that title I revolved around child benefit rather than benefits to the educational system in general.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum amount of funds authorized for the county for fiscal year 1966 under title I was $2,795,206.36. The total number of eligible children in the county for fiscal year 1966 was 12,652.

TABLE 10.—*LEA data, case No. L–5*

Number of children eligible	10, 340
Number of public-school children participating	7, 042
Number of non-public-school children participating	623
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0. 74
Expenditure per participant	$280. 95
Title I expenditure rank	1(4)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	6(16)

The maximum amount of funds authorized for the local school district for fiscal year 1966 under title I was $2,284,522.16 of which $2,153,481.92 was expended.

The LEA title I coordinator reports that planning conferences were held at upper administrative levels. These conferences involved both public and non-public-school personnel. A considerable part of the involvement of non-public-school staff occurred on the operations level; for example, orientation sessions and staff-development sessions. Non-public-school personnel were asked to react to and make suggestions about preliminary proposal outlines because local public-school people were actually working on tentative projects before the act was passed or the guidelines distributed. Information about all eligible children in the target areas was collected. Nonpublic school personnel were asked to collect data on eligible children and to select the children to participate. Teachers interviewed students and parents. Nonpublc school personnel actively participated in the in-service programs. The private schools even adjusted their schedules in some cases to increase this kind of participation.

One public school principal reported that the orientation of all personnel, public and nonpublic, was and is provided for only central office staff. Contact on the building level was limited. The field service coordinator reports that projects were developed and communications initiated with non-public-school personnel primarily at the central office level.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools reports that the local public-school central office staff developed the proposals and made decisions regarding the focus of programs. The non-public-school officials were involved after the proposal-development phase of the title I program. He reports that, even though there have been problems in the local district, he is well pleased with the situation. He indicated that other areas in the diocese are not so well off. This local school district is definitely atypical on the favorable side, as far as non-public-school participation is concerned.

Two local non-public-school principals and the local title I coordinator for Catholic schools report that they attended meetings and conferences for planning and orientation purposes. They report that public-school officials have been most willing to give help and assistance in involving non-public-school children in title I programs. The coordinator of title I for the Catholic schools reports that the major aspects of title I projects were planned by the local public central office staff. However, non-public-school personnel did read these proposals and make some suggestions. These suggestions were written into the program.

The local district developed a "buddy" system between a public school and a nearby private school to facilitate non-public-school student participation. The public sector reports that this arrangement of pairing a public school with a private school seems to be working well. Certain teachers—for example, reading and mathematics teachers—spend part of the day in a public school and part of the day in a nearby private school. The thought here is that instructional service is taken to the children rather than taking children to the service.

Regional centers have been established in which medical and dental services are available to both the public- and non-public-school children. In addition, counseling services and study center services are available to non-public-school children. The nonpublic schools made use of some mobile equipment.

Differences in annual and daily schedules initially inhibited full use of resources for non-public-school children. The nonpublic schools have made some adjustments in scheduling in order to take better advantage of public-school teachers.

The nonpublic school sector reports that those programs which are integrated with the regular program are the most productive. While health programs and summer programs benefit individual students, those projects which most directly benefit non-public-school children are those which are built into the regular school program. Also, the use of specialists and additional staff members seem to be very productive.

The following personnel and/or services are provided within the nonpublic schools: enrichment teachers, reading specialist, mathematics specialist, music specialist, social worker, counselor, physical education specialist, books, materials, and equipment and machines on loan from the public schools. The enrichment teacher, the materials, and machines are housed full time in the nonpublic schools. The various specialists provide services at scheduled times.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools reports that the participation of non-public-school children seems to be fairly close to the numbers listed in project applications.

The LEA title I coordinator reports that the evaluations for title I programs are being carried out by an outside agency, the evaluation center of the school of education of the State university. He reports that public- and non-public-school personnel are involved in evaluation activities. He stated that neither sector reviewed these evaluation reports prior to their submission to the State department of education and neither sector received copies of the evaluation reports. Non-public-school people are described as being enthusiastic about title I programs. They wish they could do more and have not been as successful as they would like in some areas. It is his impression that nonpublic schools are engaging in more activities such as: (1) grouping practices, (2) small groups, (3) team approaches, and (4) more individualization of instruction.

One local public-school principal claimed that test scores and other evaluative devices seem to indicate that expectations, in terms of student achievement, were surpassed in both the reading program and the mathematics program. This principal said that the private schools now seem to be less formal and traditional. The nonpublic schools and teachers seem to be more prone to try new approaches and new content in educational programs, since the advent of title I programs.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools stated that nonpublic- as well as public-school teachers are involved in evaluation procedures. Non-public-school officials did not review evaluation reports prior to their submission. However, the local title I coordinator for Catholic schools did receive several evaluation reports and could request information and receive it at any time. Test data are available for non-public- as well as public-school personnel.

The nonpublic sector reports that title I projects have been most productive. As a result of title I involvement, the nonpublic sector has experienced some changes in the use of instructional materials, in instructional approaches and in the ways in which professional personnel are used in the instructional situation. Non-public-school teachers are making use of machines and materials which they were not using prior to title I.

The public sector recommends the following areas for future title I projects: (1) health and recreation programs, (2) extended parent education and involvement programs, and (3) extended early-childhood programs.

The public sector also feels that much more attention should be given to training and orientation programs for inner-city teachers. In addition to more emphasis on staff development, there should be more concern for selection criteria and procedures for teachers of educationally handicapped children.

The public sector feels that focus on such areas as preschool children and home involvement will sidestep to a certain extent the church-state situation.

The nonpublic sector recommends more emphasis on the reading program. The depth, scope, and time spent on reading activities should be extended. The nonpublic sector also feels that more staff training would be most helpful. The feeling was also expressed that nonpublic schools are at a disadvantage in terms of administrative personnel to implement and facilitate title I programs in the nonpublic schools.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools states that the major problem seems to be the lack of administrative organization in the nonpublic schools. He is quite pleased with the local situation but feels that part of the success is related to the fact that he is physically close to the situation. Physical proximity is not a positive factor in terms of other programs in the diocese. Thus, for this reason alone, the local situation is atypical.

The comments of the field survey coordinator are as follows:

1. Generally, the climate for cooperation and communication between public and nonpublic personnel in the local area is healthy. Both public- and non-public-school personnel were enthusiastic about the title I program. There are a number of indications that this positive situation is definitely not typical of the diocese in general.

2. These programs were planned and are administered from the central office level. As a result, few public-school officials on the building level are involved in major policy decisions.

3. There is some indication that the situation indicated in No. 2 above has resulted in some gaps between program foci and perceived student needs. However, this feeling is not widespread.

4. The evaluation situation is quite unique in that the entire evaluation was subcontracted to an outside agency. Several public- and nonpublic-school personnel indicated a desire to see evaluation reports. Feedback data are available primarily to project directors and, through them, to teachers. However, formal evaluation reports are not widely distributed throughout the system.

5. The comparable public school-nonpublic school participation in use of personnel, facilities, and materials is evident. At present there is a great concern from public- and non-public-school personnel on the operational level regarding the pending decisions concerning program cutbacks. Central office personnel are faced with major cutbacks in certain aspects of the program due to the funding problems.

CASE L-6

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This State is located in the North Central area of the United States and borders on the Great Lakes. The local school system is a large one and is situated in the eastern part of the State. The maximum amount of funds authorized for this State for fiscal year 1966 under title I was $34,727,568.04. The total amount of funds actually committed was $30,990,551. One-half the State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963–4 was $238.34.

TABLE 11.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L–6*

Number of children eligible	145, 706
Number of public-school children participating	343, 341
Number of non-public-school children participating	65, 382
Number of nonschool participants	10, 710
Eligible: Participant ratio	1 :2. 88
Expenditure per participant	$73. 89
Title I expenditure rank	10(29)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	4(12)

The State interim report of December 1965 claims that non-public-school officials were extended an invitation to participate in regional meetings on title I. In the application review process where it is apparent that the involvement of non-public-school children is not clear, local public school officials are requested to spell out by additional attachments what steps have been taken in planning to insure nonpublic involvement. Guidelines suggest that the superintendents of public schools should—

(*a*) Inform officials of nonpublic schools of the formation of a public-school planning committee:

(*b*) Suggest that a study be made by the nonpublic schools of their pupils needs;

(*c*) Establish channels of communication between public and nonpublic schools; and

(*d*) Establish a method of determining the dollar amount of services to be provided non-public-school children.

Non-public-school representatives were members of the overall State advisory committee for implementation of title I in this State. Statewide bodies of the largest denominational school element worked very closely with the State department of education. For example, the State Catholic conference, which is an association of the five Catholic dioceses in the State, has worked, and is working, continuously with Catholic schools for better participation in Public Law 89-10 programs.

The State evaluation report for fiscal year 1966 reaffirms the close cooperation between public and nonpublic schools and cites the following statistics: a total of 279 LEA's out of 438 with a nonpublic school in their area included non-public-school children in their title I programs. Non-public-school representatives were involved in designing 293 projects. Non-public-school representatives were included in the evaluation process in 133 projects. Only 27 LEA's reported having any problems in developing and implementing title I projects with nonpublic schools.

These data are based on responses from 502 of 557 LEA's in this State.

Local education agency and non-public-school cooperative projects have ranged from shared-time activities in public-school facilities to implementing projects within nonpublic schools and to Saturday, evening, and summer activities.

As stated above, only 27 LEA's reported having any problems in developing and implementing title I projects with nonpublic schools. Some of these problems were—

1. Some nonpublic schools misinterpreted the law and felt they were to get a portion of title I funds directly;
2. Differences in salaries and working conditions made some nonpublic schools reluctant to accept staff members from public schools;
3. Some nonpublic schools were reluctant to participate on a shared-time basis;
4. Some nonpublic schools wanted equipment only, not services;
5. Difficulties in coordinating schedules at the secondary level;
6. Difficulties in identifying and justifying special needs of non-public-school children in some areas because nonpublic schools tended to serve a selective population; and
7. Difficulties arising over costs of maintenance and servicing of equipment.

The State title I director reports that in most cases communications were initiated by the public sector. He also reports that the nonpublic schools (especially the Catholic schools) have strong organizations in the State and these organizations have initiated communications on occasion. Catholic, Lutheran, Jewish, and Christian Reform are a few of the nonpublic sectors which are represented at the State Advisory Conference. The title I director reports that most pressure has been positive and has come from the religious organizations mentioned above. Negative pressure applied by a local organization (Civil Liberties Union) was never strong and seems to have almost completely died out. Eligible LEA's, which refused to participate in title I, did so because they were highly affluent districts. No districts refused to participate because of church-state questions. However, the Seventh-day Adventists in the State chose not to participate.

There were no legal problems in this State according to reports from both the public and nonpublic sector.

The Catholic superintendent of schools attended planning sessions and was in communication with the Catholic representatives on the State advisory board. He attended planning meetings in the local area. In these meetings decisions were reached regarding needs of students, focus of programs, and the degree and manner of involvement of nonpublic schools. The Catholic superintendent reports that communications have improved but are still not extensive. He also reports that, while there has been conversation by various pressure groups, he feels that such conversation has had no impact.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum amount authorized for the county for fiscal year 1966 was $1,243,896.46. The total number of eligible children in the county was 5,219. The maximum amount authorized for the local school system was $720,740.16 of which $720,113 was approved for title I projects which served 3,455 children.

TABLE 12.—*LEA data, case No. L–6*

Number of children eligible	3, 024
Number of public-school children participating	3, 120
Number of non-public-school children participating	335
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1. 14
Expenditure per participant	$208. 43
Title I expenditure rank	3(7)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	4(12)

The public sector reports that non-public-school personnel participate in in-service training programs. These include periodic one-half day workshops and a formal session planned for the summer of 1967. Non-public-school-teachers attended workshops and individual sessions which were used for orientation purposes. Also they have access to consulting services. Non-public-school personnel displayed a great deal of interest and enthusiasm in becoming involved in title I programs.

The public sector further reports that non-public-school officials were involved in determining both the nature and the extent of their desired participation in the title I program. Non-public-school personnel provided baseline data in determining eligibility of target schools.

Cumulative record cards and anecdotal records were kept for participants and were available to teachers. These cards contain information such as test scores, kinds of student participation, and materials used.

The nonpublic sector reports that it was involved in workshops, in-service training sessions, and meetings for the purpose of planning and focusing the title I program. Public-school officials were most willing to involve nonpublic schools and have been most helpful. One principal of a local nonpublic school could not say enough concerning the high regard which she had for public school personnel.

Data were requested by the public sector from the diocesan superintendent and local principles. These data were supplied.

Permanent record cards are kept on all children who participated in title I and copies of these records are sent to their respective schools.

The diocesan superintendent of schools reports that his local school district is not typical of the general climate between the two systems. In most cases the relationships are not very good. Projects were planned and focused before nonpublic schools were invited.

The public sector reports that activities took place within nonpublic-school buildings, and scheduling was done on a building basis. All children in the target school who are in the curriculum area, and on the grade level chosen, participated in the program. The public sector reports that the following services are available to, and are extensively used by, the nonpublic schools:

1. Mathematics and reading specialists.
2. Mathematics and reading materials and machines.
3. Teacher aides.
4. School social workers.
5. Participation in parent organizations.

Specialized consulting services are provided periodically and often are available upon request. Materials and teacher aides are placed permanently in the non-public-target schools, and the reading and mathematics specialists work regularly with non-public-school personnel. Title I programs were designed to service mathematics and reading needs at elementary grade levels.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools reports that all children in target schools participated in the mathematics and reading programs which the nonpublic schools agreed were the most crucial areas.

Two parochial schools—both elementary—were designated as being in the target area. The principals of both schools report that title I activities take place within the nonpublic school during regular school hours and are conducted by non-public-school personnel. They also report that reading and mathematics consultants work with their teachers. Materials and machines are kept in nonpublic schools, teacher aides are housed in nonpublic schools, and social workers render services in nonpublic schools. The teacher aides and social workers are paid with title I funds. All children in target schools participate.

The public sector reports that the nonpublic sector was involved in project evaluations. Individual teachers collect student achievement data periodically. Also, teacher attitudes, criticisms, and reactions to both student programs and in-service programs are collected. The title I program was just getting started when evaluation reports were due. As a result, the local school district report was merely a summary of what was being done. The report was compiled in the central office and was not distributed to private or public school personnel. Students were given pretests in reading and mathematics and these skill levels were used as baseline data.

The general feeling regarding title I impact is quite positive. However, there is at present very little hard data available. Formal evaluations have not been made.

Non-public school teachers are using materials and machines which they did not use before. There have been some changes in terms of teaching approaches or methodologies. Nonpublic schools are availing themselves of the services of teacher aides and social workers much more than before title I. A more extensive use of individualized reading and mathematics materials has changed the focus of content and instructional modes in nonpublic schools.

The nonpublic sector believes that title I programs appear to be productive. Teachers in nonpublic schools are using machines and materials which were not available or not being used before title I.

The field survey coordinator talked with officials from the public-school sector at the local level, and the public sector plans to post test students this year and should have some hard data to go with the present subjective-type evaluations which they have been collecting.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools spoke of the evaluation problem generally and was not referring to the local situation. He feels that evaluation is a crucial problem in title I programs. He mentioned that evaluation, in terms of non-public-school participation, was extremely difficult since most non-public-school children were involved in programs which had been developed by the public sector. In other words, it is not possible to properly evaluate if non-public-school personnel were involved after programs had been planned and focused by the public sector. Often the program did not relate directly to the most crucial needs of the nonpublic schools.

The public sector made no recommendations. The nonpublic sector would like to participate in building programs since lack of space is a major problem. The nonpublic sector would also like to add staff members in order to reduce class size. Teachers in nonpublic schools seem to be more aware of individualization of instruction as a result of title I programs. This awareness only serves to emphasize the lack of space and staff.

The nonpublic sector feels that the present programs are not focusing upon the most crucial problems in the non public elementary schools.

The diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools feels that the guidelines are restrictive in that the concept of defining and interpreting target areas is poor and is not adequately spelled out in the guidelines. Also, he feels that the guidelines should spell out the involvement of nonpublic schools in the planning and evaluation phases of projects. He suggests that letters of endorsement be required from nonpublic schools as part of project applications. This would insure involvement of nonpublic schools in planning and evaluation activities.

The field survey coordinator made the following comments:

1. Relationships between public and nonpublic schools in the local district and the degree of participation of nonpublic schools in title I programs are excellent. However, this is not a typical situation. First, the State has taken leadership in enacting legislation in this area.

Second, the local community has the advantage of the Foundation funds for initiating programs for improving instruction. Third (and this is very important), the local public schools have built an extensive and effective organization to administer such programs.

2. Nonpublic schools in the local district (as in most communities) do not have an organization which is geared up to handle Federal programs. However, the public schools in the local district do have an effective organization. Public-school personnel are very aggressive and are actively maintaining a high degree of involvement of non-public-school children.

3. This particular district stands out as one in which non-public-school officials were extensively involved in planning projects. The non-public-school officials in the local situation met with public-school personnel and jointly determined what the focus of the program would be.

CASE L–7

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This State is located in the Southwest section of the United States and borders on the Gulf of Mexico. The local school system is situated in the northeastern part of the State and is a large school system. The maximum amount of title I funds authorized for this State for fiscal year 1966 was $78,197,017.80. The total expended was $65,749,389. One half State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963–64 was $196.68.

TABLE 13.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L–7*

Number of children eligible	397, 585
Number of public school children participating	397, 731
Number of non-public-school children participating	9, 659
Number of nonschool participants	25, 621
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.04
Expenditure per participant	$151.84
Title I expenditure rank	6 (12)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	8 (19)

The State annual evaluation report contains the following information. The State education agency strongly encouraged officials of public-school districts to work with officials of the nonpublic schools located in their districts and to plan for the participation in title I of educationally deprived children enrolled in nonpublic schools. Representatives of nonpublic schools were invited to participate in the 10 regional workshops conducted in September of 1965 so that they could learn about opportunities available to them under title I. At these workshops, it was emphasized that public-school officials were required to take the initiative in contracting non-public-school officials. Consultants from all divisions of the State education agency involved in assisting local school officials in planning their title I projects were informed of the necessity for involving nonpublic schools.

The project description in the application for participtaion in Title I called for a detailed description of the efforts made to include non-public-school officials in title I planning. This section of the application was monitored by a review consultant, and the extent of these efforts to involve non-public-school officials constituted one of the criteria for approval of the application.

In many instances of cooperation between public and nonpublic schools, committees or some school officials served as the communication link. They offered leadership for:

a. Briefing and orientation sessions concerning title I in the initial stages of planning,

b. Exchange of ideas concerning instructions, equipment, materials, and procedures for non-public-school participation, and

c. Workshops for inservice training of title I staff members, in some instances, conducted by public school officials specifically for non-public-school staff members. In almost all cases non-public-school personnel were invited to attend workshops under public school auspices.

In a few instances, public school officials purchased equipment and materials upon request of officials of nonpublic schools and made these items available to nonpublic schools on a circulating basis.

A very important type of involvement was the participation of officials of nonpublic schools in the Summer Institutes for Teachers of Educationally Deprived Children. Non-public-school teachers and administrators were enrolled in several of these institutes.

Although strong encouragement was given and a monitoring system for public school officials of nonpublic schools in the planning of title I program was devised, the effort was not always successful. Of the 1,133 school districts with title I projects, only 161 (14.2 percent) reported having non-public-school pupils residing within their geographic boundaries. Statements made in the annual evaluation reports of these school districts indicated that some had made only limited efforts to involve non-public-school officials in the initial planning. On the other hand, a number of the non-public-school officials who were contacted chose not to participate because:

a. They felt that they did no have enough educationally deprived children,

b. They were located too far away from the public school,

c. They were reluctant to sign civil rights compliance forms, or

d. They did not wish to participate in federally-funded programs.

A few school districts reported that, while initial contacts and cooperation had been achieved, coordination gradually deteriorated as the year progressed.

A significant problem connected with the involvement of non-public-school children was that, while the public-school district in which the child resided was charged with the responsibility for providing special activities and services for him under title I, a number of children resided in one district but attended a nonpublic school within the geographic boundaries of a neighboring public-school district. There was no adequate provision for the transfer of funds to the receiving districts in these cases. The regulations were merely permissive and did not prescribe or require an equitable procedure for such transfer of funds.

More than one-third (37.9 percent) of the 161 public-school districts with nonpublic schools within their boundaries reported that the nonpublic schools did not participate in their title I programs. Of the 100 remaining public-school districts having nonpublic schools, 47 took advantage of title I services both during the regular school term and the summer period. These 47 districts accommodated more than three-fourths of the non-public-school children who participated in title I programs in this State.

The State title I director has stated that prior to title I there was really no basis for a relationship between the public and private sector. Since title I, relationships have been wholesome and communications have improved greatly. This improvement in communications has been a joint effort. At times, both sectors have initiated communication and confrontation. Communication and cooperation have increased during the second year of the program.

Neither sector is aware of any legal problems which hinder the participation of non-public-school children in title I projects.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum amount authorized for the county for fiscal year 1966 was $3,472,975.44 and the total number of eligible children in the county was 17,658. There are eight local school districts in the county.

TABLE 14.—*LEA data, case No. L–7*

Number of children eligible	14,369
Number of public-school children participating	9,789
Number of non-public-school children participating	456
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.71
Expenditure per participan	$205.11
Title I expenditure rank	4 (8)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	8 (19)

The LEA evaluation to the State educational agency reports that in mid-April 1966, the administrative assistant, the coordinator of project affairs, and the assistant coordinator of Project Affect met with the diocesan superintendent of Catholic schools, and later met with the respective heads of other denominational groups to discuss specifics of the program and outline plans for contacting pupils in those schools designated as being eligible for title I funds. Immediately following this meeting, the coordinator and assistant coordinator of Project Affect visited each of the designated nonpublic schools to talk with the principal and to leave enrollment materials. Each principal was asked to contact children in his building, oversee the enrollment procedures, and return the enrollment cards to the project coordinator.

The LEA coordinator of title I states that the LEA met with the leadership of the diocesan schools, the principal of the Episcopal school and the Seventh Day Adventist Academy to inform them about the title I program and how it would be carried out. There were at least three conferences and frequent telephone contacts. The interest seemed to vary with the kind of school concerned. There seemed to be a great deal of interest expressed by the Catholic diocese and the Episcopal school principal. The Seventh Day Adventist school principal was very cautious. The major concerns were with what kind of supervision and what, if any, control of the curriculum would be used.

Projects were planned, for the most part, without consultation with the nonpublic schools. Projects were planned in the best interests of all students in the district, whether public or private. The projects were presented to the nonpublic schools for their acceptance.

A non-public-school official has stated that public-school officials planned the programs and then told the nonpublic sector what was available and invited them to participate. It was assumed that the needs of both sectors were the same.

Significant changes have taken place in the second year of operation. The Catholic schools have organized a Catholic conference and have appointed a very able director of education who has prepared forms to be filled out by principals of parochial schools. This information helps to present the types of programs most helpful in the parochial schools in the target area. The title I coordinator of the LEA looks them over for possibilities.

The State Catholic conference has sent its director of education all over the State to both the diocesan and the public-school districts to clarify the role of title I programs. This has made for a good working relationship among the systems and has served to clarify issues for both sectors. The parochial schools want to be involved in the planning, to plan for the needs of their students, and to meet these needs with well-designed programs.

Project affect was the first project. It took place in the summer of 1966. The program was carried out in the public schools of the district and private-school children were encouraged to attend the school nearest to their homes. This summer program was on a completely voluntary basis. Of 10,245 participants, 456 were enrolled in nonpublic schools. This summer project was conducted completely by public-school personnel.

The nonpublic sector states that the reasons for minimal participation can be related to:

a. Lack of communication as to what is available,

b. Inappropriate nature of the program,

c. Non-public-school children were hesitant to go into the public schools because of lack of contact with them in the past.

Since this summer project many changes have taken place. There appears to be a much better understanding of the responsibility of the public schools for the non-public-school children. Also, the nonpublic schools are suggesting programs which will meet their particular needs. In the fall of 1966, several certified teachers were added to the nonpublic and public schools to work with deprived children and were paid from title I funds. A reading clinic has been established in a target area parochial school. The projects that are taking place during fiscal year 1967 are, in most cases, located in nonpublic as well as public schools. These projects exist within the regular school program and are not considered voluntary. They contain many innovations which came about because of the nature of the 1966 summer program. A summer readiness and preparation program will be held in three nonpublic schools during the summer, 1967.

Since Project Affect took place in summer, 1966, in the public schools, the evaluation also took place there. This evaluation and its report was not a mutual undertaking. However, a copy of the summer program evaluation was sent to the diocesan superintendent of schools. Evaluation procedures were hampered by a lack of baseline data on non-public-school children. All children who participated were tested at the end of the summer program. However, parochial-school youngsters did not use the same pretest; therefore, the pretest and posttest sequence was not helpful. Complete test data on participating children were sent to the school concerned.

Other changes have taken place since the summer program in 1966. This year, fiscal year 1967, the nonpublic schools were asked to furnish tests and other measures of evaluation on programs taking place in their schools. Pretests have been given, and posttest will be used. The nonpublic schools will be responsible for evaluating the programs that are underway in their schools. Program evaluation will be a shared responsibility among the LEA, the diocesan superintendent of schools, and the individual school principals and teachers.

There has been an adaptation of testing procedures to tie in with the requirements of title I programs. School supplies are made available to those who cannot afford them otherwise. A large assortment of teaching materials and equipment has been placed in the nonpublic schools on a loan basis. Also, the open lines of communication have provided for the sharing of ideas.

The public sector believes that it would be better to amplify the programs now underway than to propose new programs. The strength and growth of the present programs should be stressed, rather than initiating additional innovative projects.

Funding and timing continue to be major problems. A sizable portion of the public-school budget is concerned with Federal programs. It is hard to project the future on funds that might not be forthcoming. The Government fiscal year and the academic school year do not lend themselves to good timing procedures as far as funds are concerned. The nonpublic sector recommends a program for the visually handicapped.

It reports that more definite guidelines from HEW and the State should be transmitted to public- and non-public-school administrators alike. The nonpublic sector would like some method established whereby the amount of funds to be spent on non-public-school children can be determined. It recommends that this predetermined sum of money be spent on projects initiated by and conducted in the nonpublic schools. They would like some idea of how much is available to be spent in projects that are most needed. They express the feeling, "You really have to have some idea of the amount of money you will have before you can plan realistically."

The nonpublic sector states that the shared-time concept is not the way to solve the problem. These programs need to exist side by side in both the public and nonpublic schools.

CASE L-8

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This State is located in the Rocky Mountain area of the United States. The large school system for this case is situated in the north central part of the State. The maximum amount of funds authorized for the State for fiscal year 1966 under title I was $2,820,824. The amount of funds actually committed was $2,789,495. One-half the State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963-64 was $208.61.

Table 15.—SEA Basic State data, case No. L–8

Number of children eligible	13,522
Number of public school children participating	16,832
Number of non-public-school children participating	356
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.27
Expenditure per participant	$162.29
Title I expenditure rank	3 (8)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	7 (17)

The State evaluation to the USOE for fiscal year 1966 reports that the following steps were taken to encourage initiative in contacting non-public-school officials:

(1) A statement documenting the contact, the reaction of the private-school personnel, and the nature of their future involvement was requested.

(2) Private-school officials were involved in the regional conferences devoted to planning and implementing the program.

A non-public-school official on the regional level stated that the problems of distance and time have discouraged participation of non-public-school children. This official also said that no information was given concerning the use of equipment involved in title I activities. Further, no services were offered in the nonpublic schools. There was no communication between the public and private sectors prior to title I, causing one non-public-school official to remark, "Before title I, I didn't know they (the public sector) existed. Since title I, there has been some communication."

This same official believed that the problem of prejudice still exists and cites as an example the fact that summer school tuition was higher for non-public-school children. However, the problem was eventually resolved with the aid of a public school official at the State level.

Finally, this same non-public-school official on the regional level has recommended that plans be made which allow for more involvement and suggests, as an example, the creation of workshops for leaders of public and nonpublic schools on the problems of communication and involvement.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum amount of funds authorized for the county was $1,039,712.24. There are no data on the amount actually spent. There are four school districts in the county.

Table 16.—LEA data, case No. L–8

Number of children eligible	2.921
Number of public school children participating	2,159
Number of non-public-school children participating	189
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.80
Expenditure per participant	$259.00
Title I expenditure rank	2 (5)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	7 (17)

The LEA title I coordinator said that original planning was done on a cooperative basis with non-public-school personnel. The Catholic schools appeared to be the most interested and participated most often. However, a local Lutheran school displayed high interest and the Hebrew day school showed slight interest. While all nonpublic schools in the target area were invited to become involved in planning projects, the Catholic schools were the only ones which participated.

Local public-school principals stated that the planning of projects was done on a district basis and that they did not cooperatively plan projects with non-public-school principals in their local schools.

Non-public-school officials at the local level reported that they attended a series of meetings to orient themselves with title I and its purposes and that public-school officials were gracious and cooperative and seemed willing to involve non-public-school officials in title I programs. Lutheran school officials said that they were involved in planning projects but that their school was too small to become involved in title I activities.

The LEA coordinator stated that, during the schoolday, materials are available to teachers and children of the non-public-school sector. Non-public-school teachers could go to the instructional center and check out materials which they could use in non-public-school buildings. He felt that making materials available for non-public-school personnel for use in their own way encouraged participation. He further remarked that in-service programs did not encourage participation. The public-school office informed the non-public-school officials about available social workers and psychologists and indicated the procedures by which their services could be obtained. By mutual agreement, public-school personnel were assigned to nonpublic schools.

Public-school principals at the local level said that they had no projects in their buildings for the non-public-school pupils. They were never encouraged to make contact with the nonpublic sector and never did. Materials were made available for the nonpublic sector; but each sector, the public and nonpublic, was on its own.

Local non-public-school officials state that the materials which were made available were helpful, but other programs and activities, for example, workshops, teacher aides, et cetera, were conducted at too great a distance to be of any help to the nonpublic sector. The different schedules of the public and nonpublic created an insurmountable problem. A public-school official said that personnel services for testing eligible children were made available to the nonpublic schools.

The LEA coordinator commented that the non-public-school authorities were not involved in the evaluation of projects and did not review these evaluations before they were submitted to the State department of education. Further, nonpublic schools did not receive copies of these evaluation reports. No data on non-public-school children who participated in title I projects have been obtained.

One public-school official at the local level stated that title I activities were effective in that they provided supplementary books they haven't had and couldn't otherwise afford. Another public school official has stated that it is too early to judge the effectiveness of title I.

Non-public-school officials at the local level mentioned that they had filled out forms as requested. The lack of materials was the greatest need of the nonpublic sector. The nonpublic sector needs more equipment. Non-public-school officials were in doubt as to how much they had a right to ask for. Non-public-school officials are not aware of any changes in educational practices that have taken place as a result of involvement in title I activities.

The LEA coordinator has recommended that future funds for title I activities should be appropriated in April or May and should be on a continuing basis. He stated that in the past not enough time was devoted to planning title I activities, and that many people were away during the planning period. One of the major problems appears to be that of trying to keep within the intent of the legislation.

Public-school officials at the local level explain that a history of separation between the two sectors appears to be a major problem. Prior to title I there never was a need to cooperate and no machinery had been established for this purpose. They recommended that there be more frequent communication between the two sectors and that the leadership of the separate sectors be brought together in meeting and committee. They also recommend that non-public-school teachers meet with public-school teachers in workshop activities.

The nonpublic sector believes that a lack of communication is a major problem. Officials of nonpublic schools do not have an adequate understanding of the provisions of title I. One non-public-school official would like the public-school sector to spell out more explicitly what materials and services the nonpublic schools can obtain under title I. This same official thinks that private schools need to get involved in State educational conventions and associations.

Interested citizens at the local level indicated that, since the nonpublic sector comprises such a small percentage of the school population, they would prefer that major emphasis be placed on programs which benefit the public-school students. These interested citizens are of the opinion that the public at large has not been sufficiently informed concerning the purposes and activities of title I.

CASE L-9

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case L-9 is a large school system in the northwest section of a Pacific coast State. The maximum amount authorized to the State under title I in fiscal year 1966 was $8,166,813. One-half of the State average current expenditure per pupil amounted to $272.80.

TABLE 17.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L-9*

Number of children eligible	291,937
Number of public-school children participating	66,434
Number of non-public-school children participating	1,390
Number of nonschool participants	40
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.23
Expenditure per participant	$106.27
Title I expenditure rank	9(21)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	2(4)

The SEA followed one of the optional Federal formulas in determining the amount of money available to each LEA. In union high schools and their districts the SEA gave four-thirteenths of the number of students in each elementary district to the union high school districts that feed into it, as apportionment of and for title I funds. The calculations of the 1963-64 State average expenditure per pupil did not include the number of non-public-school students.

In fiscal year 1966, 84.4 percent of the maximum grant was expended; the figure for fiscal year 1967 was not available.

County	Grades	Enrollment	Maximum amount authorized
1. P district	Kindergarten to 12	80,600	$1,649,130.00
2. 9 others	do	25,900	755,874.80
Total			2,405,004.80

The total number of children eligible for title I in the county was 8,816.

The SEA stipulated that "each project * * * include arrangements for the participation of children enrolled in private schools consistent with the number of educationally deprived children residing in the project area and attending such schools." The State guidelines maintained that school districts mounting 1966–67 projects should include in the planning, administrators of nonpublic schools who have children residing in the project area. Mobile equipment can be temporarily loaned to nonpublic schools. If required for the successful operation of project activities, title I personnel may provide special services on the non-public-school premises. Such services must be designed to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children. The project could provide for transportation of non-public-school children to a public school participating in project activities.

Opportunities for participation in title I projects by non-public-school children must be substantially comparable to those provided for children in public schools.

The SEA guidelines and other SEA correspondence stressed the importance of planning implementation of programs to include non-public-school children. It was required that a statement of previous contact between the LEA and the nonpublic schools be included in the application.

The State constitution does not prohibit the use of title I funds to non-public-school children in any form. There were no questions pertaining to the participation of non-public-school children in title I which required a ruling by the Attorney General. (There was a decision relating to title I.)

One general title I consultant, the title I director, and special consultant for reading, language arts, and so forth, were involved in the review and approval of the fiscal year 1966 and 1967 applications. Chief nonpublic officials were not invited to participate in the review or endorsement of applications prior to approval by the SEA. The State advisory committee for title I did include a Lutheran representative, and the superintendent of the Catholic schools. In general, the SEA assured non-public-school officials that the State authorities would help nonpublic schools in "troublesome districts."

The SEA insists, as title I policy, that the LEA document their efforts to include non-public-school children. The title I director explained that the community in this case study "has been slow to implement this part of their program, and they seem to be having a little trouble communicating with each other. In other parts of the State, things seem to be working fairly smoothly."

The archdiocesan superintendent explained that "in many other districts over the State, there is a better spirit of cooperation and much more concrete cooperation, but even in (the case-study community) the spirit is friendly."

The title I director described the relationship between the SEA and chief nonpublic officials as "excellent." Title I has increased the amount of communication, but has not brought about a change of climate. Non-public-school officials also support this statement. The SEA initiated communication with the nonpublic sector and personnel in the State office communicate with the local public school authorities, and they, in turn, were asked to contact the local nonpublic schools.

It was common opinion among both State public and non-public-school officials that there is a mutual respect for competency in matters relative to title I, but the title I director expressed this reservation: "nonpublic officials tend to request specific kinds of participation, to enhance the overall program rather than things which are remedial and therapeutic for the students who are academically and educationally disadvantaged because of poverty * * * but then so do public school administrators, for that matter."

No project in the State featured dual enrollment, shared time, or facilities, and so forth, "but arrangements are in the works." There has been no involvement for the nonpublic sector, in any segment of title I evaluative process. Since title I has only been in operation from the summer of fiscal year 1966, there has not been enough involvement to evaluate.

To better meet the needs of the non-public-school children, the archdiocesan superintendent suggested remedial and therapeutic physical education. Also, he suggested psychiatric social workers.

A major problem in carrying out the intent of title I is "the fear of the public school district that public school children will suffer if nonpublic children are given any programs."

The archdiocesan superintendent offered a general solution to a lack of non-public-school involvement in title I, "repeated insistence from HEW that all children can be served." Also, "a statement from the nonpublic schools as to whether they feel they have received the help they deserved under the law, as a part of the LEA title I application."

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

This LEA is one of 12 LEA's in the county. The maximum county allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $2,405,004.80.

TABLE 18.—*LEA data, case No. L–9*

Number of children eligible	6,310
Number of public-school children participating	16,418
Number of non-public-school children participating	418
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:2.67
Expenditure per participant	$103.00
Title I expenditure rank	9 (25)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	2 (4)

In fiscal year 1966, there were nine separate projects under the general organization of three programs:

1. Model school program is located in nine core area schools where underachievement rate is high. These nine elementary schools serve a population of 6,016 children, grades k–8. Up to 90 percent of the children in some of these schools were below the city mean in achievement. Five of these schools have a heavy concentration of Negro children. This multifaceted program provide a wide variety of intensive services directed at raising the level of all the children in these schools. Because this program is directed at general elementary education in these nine schools with generally low-achievement levels, the nonpublic schools did not send children during the school day to the public school. Non-public school officials were informed of the prgoram and told them students were eligible to participate. During fiscal year 1966, nonpublic children participated in some extended day programs, in summer school and in library usage.

2. Elementary disadvantaged program emphasized the improvement of reading skills. During fiscal year 1966, nonpublic schools were informed about the reading development and library programs in the elementary schools. They were invited to make use of whatever programs and facilities that could be of service to students. Some nonpublic children participated; particularly, the afterschool library project which included individual assistance to pupils. The same invitation was extended for fiscal year 1967. Specialists will be offered to nonpublic schools for demonstrations and discussions. All the inservice classes will be open to nonpublic teachers.

3. Secondary disadvantaged program emphasis was placed on reading deficiency. Since all projects were of the in-school variety, nonpublic-school administrators did not foresee the possibility that their students would be able to participate in the total effort. Tentative arrangements were made for specialists to visit nonpublic schools for demonstrations and discussion.

The number of public and nonpublic children participating in the fiscal year 1967 program is estimated to be as follows:

	Fiscal year 1967 applications
Model school program:	
Public	3,759
Nonpublic	254
Neither	51
Elementary disadvantaged program:	
Public	1,737
Nonpublic	80
Neither	15
Secondary disadvantaged program:	
Public	1,482
Nonpublic (estimated)	55
Neither	0

The fiscal year 1966 project took place during the summer of 1966, and the fiscal year 1967 project between September 1966 and August 1967. The maximum LEA grant for fiscal year 1967 was $1,649,130.

Non-public-school children participated on public school grounds during the regular school day, after school, and during the summer.

The orientation of nonpublic personnel was "post facto" in that it took place after plans had been made and projects were ready for implementation. The LEA spent several months trying to interpret the Federal and State laws, and "even so, we (LEA) went too fast right at the beginning." The LEA planned for their own needs in the public schools, and then made these same programs available to the nonpublic schools. The assistant superintendent of the public schools explained that the "tendency (of non-public-school officials) is to demand what they want and to offer ideas that are not appropriate to title I." For example, he explained that a nonpublic elementary principal "feels she and her schools are badly treated if she does not get what she wants for her whole school, instead of limiting services to the educationally deprived. In the opinion of the assistant superintendent, "the non-public-school officials do not seem to grasp that title I is for the seriously poverty stricken and truly educationally deprived * * * title I is not generalized."

A nonpublic principal described LEA's cooperation in these terms: "I can only assume that they (LEA) did not really intend to cooperate at all, but I have only come to the conclusion lately, after giving them plenty of favorable consideration." Non-public-school officials described the cooperation of local public-school principals, stating, "There seems to be a breakdown between the upper echelons and the school principals." A nonpublic principal characterized "the willingness in title I" as "minimal, even antagonistic," but this seems to be an over-statement colored by emotion as reflected in a public principal's description of nonpublic involvement, "We shared ideas together about what could and should be done. Some of these were discarded, others were used." The public-school sector felt local nonpublic officials displayed a great deal of interest in getting something for their schools, but showed "no grasp of the intent of title I." Nonpublic teachers did not participate in the in-service program for title I because, as the assistant superintendent stated, "We just did not think of it for the first year * * * although we did the second."

The public-school officials felt that local nonpublic officials "do not grasp what real poverty is, or what title I is for." The LEA tried to arrange a public school contact for each non-public-school principal, usually the principal of the nearest public school of the same level. No nonpublic high school qualified for title I, because the highest rate of disadvantaged student enrollment was about 5 percent of the total enrollment, as compared with a rate of 15 percent as the lowest rate among public high schools.

Given the fact that the LEA officials initially planned for public school needs, project activities were scheduled at times and in places convenient for non-public-school children only secondarily. In particular, the summer project in which public school remedial teachers conducted the title I remedial reading program in the nonpublic schools resulted in no scheduling problem. Also, the extended day program, because it was held after school hours, fit the time needs of non-public-school students. Programs during the regular school day resulted in scheduling conflicts.

One factor which encouraged substantial participation by nonpublic schools was the "agitation" of an individual non-public-school principal with public school administrators. She made "constant phone calls to public school headquarters."

Prior to title I the assistant superintendent commented that there were "some congenial relationship, but not many;" it was a "non-involved mutual respect." Title I has "forced" the public and non-public schools into more cooperation and communication, and "we (public school personnel) have managed to keep the climate good." The public school officials "are trying to be patient with the "non-public-school principals' impatience, and gradually show them how we must operate under title I."

A non-public-school principal described a "high state of tension" between the public and nonpublic schools, not at the principal level, but "higher up." There was a consensus among all officials that there has been an "improvement" in attitudinal relationships between the two sectors.

The climate of communication is polite and congenial, but limited by need. Unless there is some definite need, the public and nonpublic school personnel do not communicate.

Non-public-school officials were not involved in any phase of the evaluation fiscal year 1966 title I projects. They did not receive copies of the evaluation report.

Non-public-school officials felt title I was not effective in meeting the needs of nonpublic children; "there has been almost no program," except for remedial reading.

The LEA title I coordinator observed a need for "more freely working lines of communication, and a more refined and more realistic definition of the 'disadvantaged child'." The assistant superintendent asserted that the "non-public-school principals would be better off if they could understand the true intent of the remedial and therapeutic kinds of programs intended by title I."

Non-public-school principals vowed a need for "sound workers, teacher aides, and more remedial reading," and criticized the "unsuitable criteria" for inclusion in title I programs. Criticism from non-public-school personnel was directed in two areas: "unsatisfactory communication with public officials, and not being on any of the planning" of title I.

This city is in the throes of a sort of crisis in its public-nonpublic school relationships. A principal of nonpublic school would appear to be one of the irritants in an already unstable situation. The administrator very nearly answered all the areas to be covered in the response to one question. She was not visibly angry or upset, but she said she has finally come to the conclusion that there is a conscious effort, and fairly determined one, not to include non-public-school children unless the public schools are compelled to do so. The public-school administrators may have been possibly dragging their feet somewhat in providing title I assistance to non-public-school children, but evidence also suggests that they are correct in their opinion that the public schools bear a much greater burden of seriously deprived "clientele" than do the nonpublic schools. This is supported by impressions from visiting schools and observing where parish and public-school boundaries fall in relation to these stricken and not-so-stricken areas.

Communication is poor and colored by emotion. The administrative personnel of the non-public-school system do not seem to grasp the exact nature or explicit requirements of title I. Nothing is happening yet to improve the situation.

CASE L–10

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This State is located on the west coast of the United States. The local school district is a large district and is situated in the north central sector of the State.

The maximum amount authorized for this State for fiscal year 1966 was $77,886,285.51 with 1,205 school districts eligible to apply for funds. A total of 1,044 districts participated in the first year's program and received approval for $73,819,443 for 1,353 separate projects. One-half the State average current expenditures per pupil for 1963–64 was $252.67.

TABLE 19.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. L–10*

Number of children eligible	308,253
Number of public-school children participating	258,761
Number of non-public-school children participating	19,817
Number of nonschool participants	10,804
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.94
Expenditure per participant	$255.09
Title I expenditure rank	1 (2)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	3 (9)

Title I projects reached children of all ages, ranging from preschoolers to teenagers who had dropped out of high school. The majority of the activities were in the elementary schools, especially in the second, third, and fourth grades. In addition, title I activities often involved the parents of target area students.

The State evaluation report for fiscal year 1966 states that the Federal requirement that non-public-school children be given an opportunity to participate in title I programs opened up channels of communication between public and non-public-school officials.

About 8 percent of the children participating in title I activities were enrolled in nonpublic schools, most in parochial schools.

The most successful activities were those which Federal regulations allowed to be implemented on non-public-school facilities. These were auxiliary services, such as health, psychological, and counseling programs, and remedial instruction, in which the title I teachers traveled to the nonpublic school for a specified time each day or week. Cultural enrichment activities were also common projects involving both public and non-public-school children.

Federal legislation mandated that control over employees and equipment funded by title I was to remain in the public school district, which would provide the services to the children enrolled in nonpublic schools.

The State guidelines for compensatory education state that LEA's shall provide compulsory education services for educationally deprived children enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. Opportunities for these children to participate on the basis of designated target areas shall be comparable to those provided for children enrolled in public schools. The applicant school district was required to furnish evidence that it provided for the participation of non-public-school children who reside in the target areas. Such evidence was furnished by the public school district in its project application.

The State director of title I reported that non-public-school officials did not review or endorse applications prior to their approval during fiscal year 1966. However, non-public-school officials were invited to assist in developing guidelines.

In the second year of operation private and parochial schools participated in originating the guidelines. The public sector insisted on a committee with representation from different private and parochial schools on the advisory committee. Also, State public school officials required a joint signature by a non-public-school leader and an LEA official when a nonpublic school is in the district.

The State title I director explained that Seventh Day Adventists were against Federal aid. Also, some private academics noted they had no eligible children. He further stated that communications were initiated and encouraged by the public sector since the nonpublic sector often was not aware of the benefits. Since the programs were for children and not institutions, public school officials made sure the children were identified, even if the institution failed to do so.

At the present time there is understanding and agreement about the provisions of the act. Earlier there was disagreement because of misunderstanding of the intent of the law, and what services, what materials, et cetera, could be provided.

In some counties questions on busing non-public-school children were raised. The State law, however, permits the busing of non-public-school children.

In one county, allocation of funds was delayed pending a ruling by the Attorney General. One county delayed the first year, because it did not believe in Federal aid.

There did not appear to be any major legal problem in this State.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum amount authorized for the county for fiscal year 1966 was $2,376,361.35. The total number of eligible children in the county was 9,405.

TABLE 20.—*LEA data, case No. L-10*

Number of children eligible	1, 550
Number of public-school children participating	1, 972
Number of non-public-school children participating	106
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1. 34
Expenditure per participant	$188. 47
Title I expenditure rank	5(11)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	3(9)

The maximum amount authorized for the local school system was $391,638.50, 1,588 students participated in the title I program.

The public school officials at the local level reported that the district provided orientation activities for the nonpublic sector. Local public school principals explained that they visited Roman Catholic schools and invited the school personnel to some to the public schools and ask questions if they wished. Services were offered by the public sector. The public sector reported that the Catholic schools have shown great interest, but no interest has been shown by other nonpublic schools.

The local coordinator of title I stated that the nonpublic sector was involved in planning projects under the guidance of the public sector and that non-public-school officials were consulted concerning their needs. He also asserted that the nonpublic schools had a voice in determining the final focus of projects. He further explained that the public sector requested information about non-public-school students directly from the schools. Public school officials visited the nonpublic schools, to meet and talk with teachers. Non-public-school personnel attended inservice audiovisual and reading programs within the district.

The nonpublic sector reports that the State conducted excellent orientation activities. Non-public-school officials were involved in writing guidelines and invited to regional meetings. The nonpublic sector was not involved in planning projects at the local level, although the assistant superintendent of the Catholic school department explained that he had suggested some programs to the LEA.

A principal of a local nonpublic school commented that there were good relations on the selection of materials and good advice. The public sector built a special classroom for children in the nonpublic school and provided the nonpublic school with a resource teacher for remedial reading in grades 1 to 6. No inservice help was provided for the nonpublic sector.

The assistant superintendent of the Catholic school department felt that this local school district is typical but not as good as some others. He reports that problems are prevalent in the suburbs.

Project activities were conducted in both public and nonpublic schools. Reading and library activities were carried out in the nonpublic-school buildings.

Summer programs were scheduled at times and places convenient for non-public-school children. One public school principal explained that a parent education program has been conducted both mornings and afternoons. The public sector sent inivitations to the parents and also announced the program in the local papers. The public sector reported that counseling and psychological services are offered continuously at the public school. One public school principal mentioned that its counselor, who is Catholic, does much informal counseling with nonpublic-school children. It was also stated that public school reading teachers were assigned to nonpublic schools.

The title I LEA coordinator accounts for discrepancies between the number of non-public-school children listed on the project application and the number of those who actually participated by reporting that Seventh-day Adventists and some Baptists do not participate. The nonpublic sector explains discrepancies between the number of non-public-school children listed on the project applications and the number of those who actually participated by reporting that services were provided on educational characteristics and not on economic criteria. Some participated because of an educational need and not because of an economic need.

The LEA reports that the nonpublic schools were involved in the evaluation process. The nonpublic sector reviewed some, but not all, evaluation reports prior to their submission to the State department of education. Public-school officials were not certain whether the nonpublic sector received copies of these evaluation reports. The local coordinator of title I reports that the nonpublic sector will be involved to a greater extent in evaluation during the second year of operation. The public sector feels that title I projects were effective in meeting the needs of non-public-school students. Reports are made to the parents and to the appropriate school for children in the summer program. The local coordinator of title I commented that data are not sent to the nonpublic schools. The public sector reports that changes have taken place in the nonpublic school as a result of title I. Such changes include a language laboratory, library services, small groups for remedial reading, new personnel, part-time reading teacher, and the use of many new materials.

Nonpublic officials stated that they were involved in evaluating projects. They did their own testing and were asked to evaluate programs conducted within their school buildings. However, nonpublic personnel did not review project evaluations prior to their submission nor did they receive copies of these evaluation reports. During the second year of operation, the nonpublic sector is doing its own pre- and post-achievement testing, and hence will have their own test scores and other data on non-public-school children. A reading teacher in the nonpublic school has reported that title I has been effective in meeting the needs of non-public-school children.

The local coordinator of title I stated that there is a need for additional personnel to run these new programs. He further reports that better communications are needed. He also recommends a more complete briefing on the program and suggests that perhaps applications could be approved faster, in order to give the LEA more time. He feels that no one really knew the law when title I first started. One local public school principal reports that the major problem is individuals—it takes time to change attitudes.

The nonpublic sector prefers the services to come into the nonpublic-school buildings. The assistant superintendent of the Catholic school department says, "A major problem is ignorance" and suggested hiring liaison personnel. If the service of a coordinator could come to an organized system of private schools, things would move swiftly. The Catholic sector does not have the money to do this.

A local non-public-school principal says that psychological services would be helpful. This same principal lists as major problems the lack of transportation scheduling and the small number of children involved. This principal suggested cooperative scheduling as a solution: "We need to know now how children will be involved, so that we can schedule them for it." A second local non-public-school principal reports that initially space was a problem, but this situation has been taken care of.

Interested citizens have reported that title I activities appear to be very effective in meeting the needs of all children who are eligible. These citizens agree that both sectors should share the services of title I. One citizen favors joint programs while another citizen suggests greater communication between the public and nonpublic sectors. Another citizen reports that this year the children have more incentive and don't "cut school like they did last year."

It appears that many initial problems are being solved as the programs begin to establish themselves and as both sectors learn more about acceptable programs and services available under title I. Both sectors appear willing to cooperate with each other, but the Catholic sector may well suffer from an organizational weakness, in that it does not have a person to coordinate their title I efforts.

CHAPTER III

CASE STUDIES—MEDIUM-SIZED SCHOOL SYSTEMS

The case reports contained in this chapter describe the 10 medium-size school systems selected for the sample. Enrollment for these schools were in a range between 10,000 to 36,000 students. The geographic distribution is as follows: two Southeastern States, two Eastern States, two North Central States, one Southern State, two Rocky Mountain States, and one State on the west coast. As is the case among the large school systems, each district is located in a different State.

Information for these 10 cases has been obtained from the same sources mentioned in the introduction to chapter II. The descriptions of State and local characteristics follows a pattern similar to those cases in the previous chapter.

CASE M–1

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case M–1 is based on a medium-size-community school system in a northeastern county of a Middle Atlantic State. The maximum allocation for fiscal year 1966 amounted to $24,560,286.39. Ninety-nine percent of this authorized amount was used. The fiscal year 1967 allocation amounted to 85 percent of the maximum basic grant for fiscal year 1966, approximately $20,880,000. Again 99 percent has been expended on funded projects. One-half of the State average current expenditure per pupil 1963–64 amounted to $287.79.

TABLE 21.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M–1*

Number of children eligible	85.341
Number of public-school children participating	52.595
Number of non-public-school children participating	10.067
Number of nonschool participants	2,051
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.76
Expenditure per participant	$375.73
Title I expenditure rank	1(1)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	1(2)

Article 8, section 3 of the State constitution prohibits donation of land or appropriation of money to or for the use of any society, association, or corporation whatever. An annotation was later added and reads, "Authorizing school district boards of education to contract for transportation of children to and from schools, including other than public schools, is not unconstitutional."

In November 1965, the State attorney general ruled favorably on the question of shared time and shared services between the two school systems.

In April 1965, after the passage of Public Law 89–10, the State department of education organized an office to coordinate the implementation of ESEA legislation. The staff of this office concerned itself, initially, with informing the local school administrators of their responsibility under title I.

During the early part of the summer of 1965, even before there was an LEA coordinator, public school officials contacted the pastors and principals in each of the four dioceses. They were asked to make a list of their needs. School administrators from Protestant parochial schools and from Hebrew day schools were also invited to these meetings.

The State operates an intermediate administrative office at the county level, with a county superintendent of schools and a staff of assistants who are employees of the State department of education. These personnel provided direction and guidance to the LEA within the county.

The final effort to provide assistance to the local districts was made by organizing members of the title I staff, members of the division of curriculum and instruction, and members of the County Helping Teacher Group into regional teams. A regional team was composed of four members, each with a different field of specialization. The State was divided into four areas each consisting of a number of counties, and the team scheduled visits in each of the counties in its region. With this system of organization as many as 100 people have been in the field to assist every applicant district by giving individual assistance and attention in the planning, development, and operation of its project. The same approach was used in providing assistance to the LEA in the evaluation of projects. This system proved to be highly successful and was continued in fiscal year 1967 and will be used again in fiscal year 1968.

The State title I director and his staff require that the LEA's submit written evidence of cooperative planning and exchange with non-public-school personnel. Public-school officials were encouraged and frequently urged to involve non-public-school personnel in the planning stage of projects. A December 1966 newsletter from the State title I office restates that the key to eligibility of non-public-school students is—

> Residence in the project area identified by the LEA, and the student's need for the services of the project. * * * All public school administrators are urged to involve their non-public-school colleagues in the planning stages of their title I programs so that specifics of the involvement of non-public-school students can be worked out at that point rather than when the program is in actual operation.

The State title I director was keenly aware of specific instances of intercommunication of both school sectors at the local level, as well as at the State level.

> We invite non-public-school superintendents to all our meetings. I have received not one letter challenging the inclusion of non-public-school children. There has been some noise in the newspapers but nothing directed to my office. Even the newspaper reports have decreased. As a result of this new source of intercommunication, these people (public and nonpublic school administrators) are much more aware of each other's problems than they were prior to title I. Initially public school officials felt that non-public-school personnel did not know what was going on, but this has changed. Through the efforts of the diocesan superintendent (one of four in this State) and the diocesan director of Government programs, they (non-public-school personnel) have become very well informed.

According to the diocesan director of Government programs in this area, the relationship between the State department of education and the chief non-public-school officials has been very good. The non-public-school administrators were encouraged by the favorable decision at the State level concerning shared time and shared services. Any opposition was caused by lack of information or failure to recognize the needs of the educationally deprived. Opposition disappeared when adequate explanations were made. Shared services are rendered on the non-public-school premises, thus increasing non-public-school children's participation in the projects.

During fiscal year 1966, due to time pressures caused by Federal appropriations in the fall of 1965, projects had to be submitted for approval before non-public-school personnel review them. This was not the case in fiscal year 1967.

The non-public-school personnel at the diocesan level knew very little about evaluation procedures at the State or local levels. Individual progress reports and test results have been sent to participating nonpublic schools; however, copies of the LEA fiscal year 1966 evaluation report were not circulated. Involvement in title I projects has made non-public-school administrators more cognizant of unique and special needs of educationally disadvantaged children which are not being met by the existing curriculum.

> Concerted effort on the part of non-public-school administrators to improve public relations and to rid the public of the impression that our schools exist primarily for religious indoctrination must be made.

The climate between the two sectors at the State level is exemplary. This greatly facilitates possible participation at the local level.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The State is divided into 21 counties. County X identified 5,624 eligible children in fiscal year 1966 and received authorization for $1,618,530.96. Of the 19 LEA's in this county, the one selected for our study received 68 percent of the county allocation, and 2,694 children participated in the program. No eligibility data were available for fiscal year 1966; but in fiscal year 1967, 5,108 children (5–17) came from low-income families.

TABLE 22.—*LEA data, case No. M–1*

Number of children eligible	3,826
Number of public-school children participating	1,670
Number of non-public-school children participating	424
Number of nonschool participants	600
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.70
Expenditure per participant	$408.72
Title I expenditure rank	1(1)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	1(2)

The LEA administers 28 school buildings; 14 of them are located in target areas. Fourteen nonpublic schools share this same attendance area. Seven of these are in the target area. Projects approved for this LEA include reduction of class size, remedial program in reading and mathematics, special education classes, prekindergarten and kindergarten programs, health services, a summer school program, parent conference and home visits, purchase of equipment and materials, including relocatable classrooms.

Preplanning dialog between the public- and non-public-school personnel was highly satisfactory. Wonderful rapport and articulation characterized these meetings. One public school principal remarked. "Enthusiastic, possibly more enthusiastic than some of ours. They are very willing to work and want all they can get." Each principal communicated the special needs of the educationally deprived children enrolled in his school. The final focus of the program was determined by the LEA coordinator and his staff. Some principals are unhappy with this arrangement. Once the project had been approved, dialog continued during the implementation phase.

In this community the mayor seems to have educational as well as political responsibilities. A 16-week in-service training program was scheduled in the spring of 1966 for 600 teachers and specialists from both systems who were involved in title I. * * * Because attendance was poor (some teachers felt it was a waste of time; others said it was poorly run), the mayor refused to allow released time for teachers to attend the program. This caused much embarrassment to the local superintendent, according to a public school administrator. From a non-public-school official we note: "We felt we had hit an impasse with the LEA coordinator, so we went directly to the mayor." This seems to be an accepted pattern of communication in this local school system.

The diocesan superintendent and the coordinator of Government programs coordinate, inform, encourage, and counsel non-public-school administrators in this district. Data and supplementary information about eligible non-public-school students were readily available and were furnished on request.

The non-public-school children participated in the remedial reading and language projects. They also received health services, and equipment was loaned to the nonpublic schools. A small group of non-public-school students shared in the cultural program when they attended an opera.

The nonpublic sector was dissatisfied with the final form of the approved remedial reading program. Our original proposal was to have a reading clinic serviced by a specialist in each of our seven schools. Instead they (LEA coordinator and staff) bought six mobile units at $26,000 each. Four public schools were identified as project areas. They each received a mobile unit. The other two units serviced two eligible nonpublic schools. If they had not purchased these units, other specialists could have been hired. * * * If money had been spent more wisely, additional qualified people might have been hired to help a greater number of educationally deprived children. One non-public-school principal said, "All the youngsters I'm responsible for have received aid but not all the other parochial schools have fared so well."

Promises of greater non-public-school participation in fiscal year 1967 made by the LEA coordinator failed to materialize. Instead, signs of serious inequitable sharing are evidenced by the following description of project activities and services: (1) Reduction of class size. Forty additional primary grade teachers have been hired in order to reduce the student-teacher ratio to no more than 1 to 20 or 24 students in grades K-4 in severely overcrowded schools. From fiscal year 1967 application: "Since the nature of this program does not directly affect the nonpublic schools, no arrangements have been made for their participation in this phase of our title I program." Witness the illogical conclusion inherent in the following statement: "Educationally disadvantaged non-public-school children only become eligible when they are taught by public-school teachers." (2) A more effective reading program. Twelve additional reading specialists will be hired and will be assigned to the target area public and nonpublic schools. A reading clinic will be equipped for the nonpublic schools. "Non-public-school children will participate through the service of two mobile reading clinics and two reading specialists." (3) Expanded special education program. Six full-time teachers, fully certificated in the area of special education, will be assigned to work in the public school system. Each child will participate 30 hours per week, up to 40 weeks in the program. "Since the nature of this program does not directly affect the nonpublic schools, no arrangements have been made for their participation * * *." (4) Expanded health services for disadvantaged children. An assistant supervisor of nurses, six school nurses, and two school doctors will be added to the medical staff of this LEA. "Complete medical examinations will be given to all non-public-school children, as well as those attending public schools located in the target area." Interviews with three non-public-school administrators failed to reveal evidence of the breadth and scope of this activity. (5) Teaching English as a second language to Spanish-speaking children. "One of five language arts instructors will be assigned to the nonpublic schools." One non-public-school principal mentioned that a highly competent language arts instructor works with 54 kindergarten children in her school every day.

The project director of the summer school program said that he had been associated with parochial schools in implementing the summer program. "The public-school teachers were impressed with the behavior of parochial-school children. Children from both sectors got along well together and seemed to enjoy joint programs. Public and non-public-school administrators were enthusiastic about the summer program."

Generally, there were expressions of mutual respect for one another's system of education. The more dialog, the better the understanding. One non-public-school principal appears reticent when she says, "We couldn't evaluate their programs because we are not that well acquainted with them. Even where parochial schools are directly opposite public schools with reading clinics, there has been no offer to share this service." The LEA coordinator admitted this was a mistake, and indicated that an attempt to rectify this situation would be made.

A public-school principal remarked that only troublesome children transfer from the parochial schools to his building. "They eliminate their problems by sending them here. They also have some noncertificated teachers on the staff."

Questionnaires designed to evaluate the in-service program for specialists and teachers of eligible students and the medical program were sent to non-public-school administrators. Title I project directors and the members of their staffs assisted the LEA coordinator and his staff in the evaluation of projects; one public school principal indicated that they—he and other public school principals—want a committee of public- and non-public-school personnel to assist in project evaluations for fiscal year 1967. The LEA fiscal year 1966 evaluation report was very sketchy. "This year if it is more substantial, we'll be happy to send them (non-public-school officials) a copy."

Each non-public-school child who participated in the 1966 summer program was subjectively evaluated and a folder was sent to his school. No test scores were sent.

Recommendations for improving communications included one which called for a greater degree of cooperation between title I and community action programs at the local level. There is some unnecessary duplication of project activities. Late funding is a serious problem.

Personnel qualified to render special services in the field of guidance, psychology, and social work are needed. Prior to title I, children in need of psychological services had to transfer to public schools.

Qualified non-public-school teachers should be considered for staff positions. Frequent complaints about insufficient personnel would be reduced and greater numbers of educationally disadvantaged youngsters would be served.

More equitable sharing of equipment and materials was urged by non-public-school officials.

Two interested citizens, one, a non-Catholic clergyman and the other a task force officer, were interviewed. Both are members of the citizens advisory committee and are familiar with the title I program in the local school district.

Prior to title I there was little or no cooperation between the two sectors. With the advent of ESEA legislation, the citizens advisory committee, representing a variety of professional interests, was created. The members acted as liaison personnel between the public and the school system. "There is a feeling in this community that there are not many disadvantaged youngsters in parochial schools, even after facts have been presented by the diocese. The diocesan superintendent is very alert and is increasingly aware of the poor conditions in public schools."

"The ESEA staff is not spending the money as effectively as it should be spent," was another comment.

Two pressure groups—namely, the teachers' union and a taxpayers group—were in favor of non-public-school participation in title I activities. Both interviewees agreed that involvement of non-public-school children in title I programs definitely served the educational needs of the community. "I have great respect for the way the Catholics run their schools and train the children."

The LEA title I staff paid little attention to the CAC priority list of suggestions for projects. They were not even contacted prior to fiscal year 1967 applications.

The community is not aware of the needs of youngsters in the Catholic schools. They tend to see the Catholic Church as a wealthy institution. "We Protestants need to see their (nonpublic schools) educational goals in a broader perspective. They should undertake a campaign of public relations to inform the community at large of their educational goals and objectives. The tax-saving element of the system needs to be emphasized. Their schools are more than just an extension of the parish and the home."

Public-school officials may fear adverse community reaction if too much is given to nonpublic schools. "The deeply ingrained human problem of 'let's keep as much as we can for ourselves' seems to be a factor which lessens non-public-school participation," commented one of the interested citizens.

CASE M–2

Case M–2 is a medium school system of a southern New England State. The maximum amount authorized to this State under title I in fiscal year 1966 was $7,196,503.56. One-half the State average expenditure for 1963–64 was $254.06.

TABLE 23.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M–2*

Number of children eligible	28, 326
Number of public-school children participating	41, 077
Number of non-public-school children participating	2, 788
Number of nonschool participants	844
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1. 58
Expenditure per participant	$160. 96
Title I expenditure rank	5(10)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	3(8)

Seven conferences were held with regional superintendent's groups and the large city superintendents during November and December 1966 and 1967 to expedite title I implementation. At each of these workshops and conferences, non-public-school participation in title I was discussed.

A total of 11 meetings relating to title I were held in the fall of 1965 with the Executive Committee of the Association of Public School Superintendents, the superintendents of the Catholic diocesan schools, and representatives of the State Association of Independent Schools in attendance.

State guidelines, distributed to each LEA, describe the non-public-school requirements for title I programs and suggest services and arrangements permitted under the law.

Each project application was required to show the degree or manner of the expected participation by children enrolled in nonpublic schools. The SEA evaluation reports for title I projects required the LEA to indicate the number of non-public-school children and youth served, the arrangement, and the location in which services were rendered.

Throughout the State, projects which served non-public-school children by various arrangements were as follows:

(a) 6 projects—a program conducted on public school premises.
(b) 4 projects—dual enrollment on public school premises.
(c) 12 projects—program conducted on private school premises.
(d) 7 projects—program conducted in a place other than a public or private school.

There were no constitutional issues or problems evident in this State.

The assistant diocesan superintendent for Catholic schools described the relationships between the SEA and non-public-school personnel as "good." They have not changed in any significant way since the implementation of title I. The SEA informs the diocesan superintendent on all educational matters, and most communications are between the public school and non-public-school authorities, and pressure groups have not been operative.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The title I project in this community was a remedial program to serve children with reading problems. A working committee was appointed by the LEA to plan and design the title I program; no nonpublic-school personnel were involved on this committee, but they were consulted. There were four parochial schools located in the attendance area for the project. In these schools, the percentage of pupils whose parents earned $2,000 and under per year was too low for total inclusion in the project.

TABLE 24.—*LEA data, case No. M-2*

Number of children eligible	870
Number of public schoolchildren participating	525
Number of non-public-school children participating	0
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.60
Expenditure per participant	$394.48
Title I expenditure rank	2(2)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	3(8)

The diocesan superintendent appointed two Catholic school principals to work with the LEA on the title I proposal. They were involved in the decision to exclude nonpublic children from the title I program. The LEA officials and the two Catholic principals decided to "keep the lines of communication open and to further discuss the feasibility of offering remedial reading services to the few pupils who might benefit." There were no other private schools in the attendance area. The policy relative to nonpublic schools in fiscal year 1966 was repeated for fiscal year 1967.

The maximum basic grant for fiscal year 1966 was $221,064.29. The funds approved for the project were $207,100.

The fiscal year 1966 project was carried out between January 1966, and August 31, 1966. In fiscal year 1967 the project took place from September 1966 to June 1967.

The LEA title I coordinator requested the appointment of a parochial school coordinator in the initial planning stages of title I activity, and a Catholic school principal was appointed by the diocesan office of education. The title I coordinator has sought information from the diocesan superintendent's office and has provided that office with notices regarding all developments under title I, but there was no "followup" by the diocesan superintendent. The title I coordinator was and is reluctant to contact local parochial scshools without authority from the diocesan superintendent.

Parochial school personnel were not involved in the planning of title I projects, because it was determined by consultation with the parochial school principals that the number of eligible children in parochial schools were very small. The parochial-school consultants attended the first planning session, and later, in conference with one of these representatives, it was determined that there were not enough eligible parochial school students to make an attempt at a coordinated program. Information regarding the number of eligible children in parochial schools was requested from the parochial school representative during the preparation of the title I proposals, but no estimate of numbers was made available. Parochial-school personnel were not included in inservice training programs because of their nonparticipation in the projects. The LEA title I coordinator believes that non-public-school teachers receiving pupils who have attended summer programs under title I are probably not well informed about the programs. Information is provided by the LEA, but everything must be directed through the office of the diocesan superintendent and "the communication chain seems to break down at this point; word does not reach the individual schools, much less individual teachers."

It was the consensus of public-school officials that the nonpublic schools showed little interest in involvement in title I, except for the summer program.

The assistant superintendent for the diocesan schools made the judgment that there were too few non-public-school students to warrant inclusion in title I. He explained that no information regarding number of eligible parochial schoolchildren was sought for the diocesan superintendent's office, but this is in conflict with the testimony of the title I LEA coordinator, and possibly reflects a lack of communication within the diocesan office of education.

The Catholic school liaison officer for Federal programs was not aware of any participation by non-public-school personnel in the planning phase, or of any consultation with parochial school officials. She had not been contacted by either the LEA or the diocesan office about the number of nonpublic students that might have been eligible for participation.

No orientation to title I projects was conducted by the LEA for non-public-school teachers, and no instructions were received by the non-public-school teachers from diocesan or community authorities indicating that parochial school personnel might seek such orientation.

Parochial school pupils have been involved only in the summer programs under title I. Announcement of this program was made by mailing, directly to the parochial schools, the same bulletin that was used to describe the program to public schoolteachers and principals. The title I coordinator's experience led him to conclude that direct communication with individual parochial schools fosters the participation of their students in programs, while indirect communication through the diocesan superintendent's office impedes such participation.

No title I activities in this LEA were carried out in nonpublic schools, and all special services provided by public-school personnel were restricted to public schools. The operational pattern did not differ from academic year to summer program.

The schedule of the title I program was such that non-public-school students could have participated without much difficulty, but with the exception of the summer program, there was no participation.

Cooperative efforts with parochial school principals and supervisors would not present any particular difficulties in the opinion of the LEA title I coordinator, but when everything has to be channeled through the diocesan office, the cooperative efforts never seem to get underway. Title I has not changed this situation in any way, "nor is it a matter of the individual proclivities of any particular diocesan superintendent; communication just bogs down."

A non-public-school principal stated the opinion that although parochial school personnel believe that the public schools offer programs of high quality, they see no evidence on the part of public school personnel of any desire for joint programs. The only communication of which she was aware was the summer school announcement, and then she was unsure that it was related to title I. This instance brings into question the quality of communication within the parochial-school system, as well as the nature of contacts between public school and non-public-school administrative officials.

The attitude of some pastors, that participation in federally financed programs will eventually lead to Federal imposition, was a significant deterrent in certain instances.

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in any way in project evaluations. Advisory copies of the evaluation report were sent to the diocesan superintendent of schools. Since parochial-school pupils were not involved, there was no reason for review of the report by the diocesan superintendent. In answer to a question concerning the effectiveness of the title I projects in meeting the needs of non-public-school students, the LEA title I coordinator explained that "we have no choice but to accept the conclusion of their designated representative that the needs (of nonpublic students) in this particular regard are minimal."

A public school principal observed that the inclusion of nonpublic school children in title I projects "was not automatic, and their leadership did not push for inclusion."

The LEA title I coordinator saw communication as the major problem, and the main cause of this difficulty as the remoteness of the diocesan superintendent, and the fact that he has so many school districts, with which he must deal. If it were possible for the public schools to work directly with parochial schools in the districts, cooperative efforts could be initiated. The LEA coordinator felt that the initiative for making this possible must come from the diocesan superintendent.

The public schools are not accustomed to thinking in terms of the needs of the non-public-school children, and the parochial schools do not seem anxious to get involved in any kind of coordinated program, except for the summer program. The tradition of coordinated programs does not exist in this community, and the parochial-school officials have not exercised any initiative to establish such programs. If a solution is to be found it will have to begin with some formal structure involving active school people from both systems.

CASE M-3

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case M-3 is a medium-size local school system, the only LEA in the county. The county is located on the eastern border of a Southern Atlantic State. All 159 counties of the State were eligible for title I funds. A total of 239,789 eligible children authorized a maximum basic grant of $37,342,340.97 for fiscal year 1966. Approximately 85 percent of this amount was allocated in fiscal year 1967. One-half the State average current expenditure per pupil 1963-64 was $155.73.

TABLE 25.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M–3*

Number of children eligible	239, 789
Number of public-school children participating	388, 084
Number of non-public-school children participating	1, 316
Number of nonschool participants	7, 481
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1. 66
Expenditure per participant	$94. 09
Title I expenditure rank	9(25)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	10(27)

Article 1 of the State constitution specifies that no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect, or denomination of religionists, or of any sectarian institution.

However, article 8, section 2, states:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this constitution, the general assembly may by law provide for grants of State, county, or municipal funds to citizens of the State for educational purposes, in discharge of all obligations of the State to provide adequate education for its citizens.

There is no provision for free transportation for schoolchildren attending nonpublic schools.

Shortly after the enactment of Public Law 89–10, the State department of education began rendering assistance to LEA's for the planning of the implementation of all parts of the act, especially title I. Statewide and semistatewide meetings of LEA superintendents were conducted by State department of education personnel. Regional meetings in each of the 10 congressional districts were attended by LEA superientendents and anyone else whom they wished to invite. The diocesan superintendent of one or two dioceses in this State did not attend and was not invited to attend any of these meetings.

The fiscal year 1966 SEA evaluation supplied the following information: (*a*) The necessity for including eligible non-public-school children in projects has been emphasized to local school administrators through personal contacts and group conferences as well as through printed copies of the "Act, Regulations, and Guidelines." The description of each project must contain information relative to the nature and extent of the involvement of non-public-school children in the activity or service. If non-public-school children are not to participate, the reason for nonparticipation must be satisfactorily explained before the project is approved, (*b*) cooperation between the two sectors on title I projects has been good. Perhaps the greatest amount of participation by non-public-school children was in summer projects which provided remedial instruction, (*c*) no major problems have arisen in developing and implementing title I projects involving both public and non-public-school children. In a few instances it has been rather difficult to get public school officials to actively involve non-public-school officials in the planning stage rather than informing them about what has been done after the planning had been completed.

Since projects are administered by public school officials, direct contacts with public school pupils and their parents are more easily made than with non-public-school children and their parents. Public school pupils are more readily accessible for such activities as surveys, screening tests, and the dissemination of project information directly into the homes.

The first contacts concerning title I were made when LEA coordinators of title I programs for several local school systems met with the diocesan superintendent to inform him of projects which had been submitted for approval.

The State title I director cited two reasons why non-public-school children were not included in approved projects: (1) No non-public-school children living in target areas, and (2) non-public-school officials did not believe their children needed the aid.

There have been no legal involvements at the State level. Two LEA's failed to file acceptable applications prior to the May 2, 1966, deadline. Neither one centered around the church-state issue.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The State is divided into 159 counties and into 195 LEA's. In the majority of cases the LEA is an autonomous administrative unit within the country. This is true of the LEA selected for this study. With half the State average per-pupil expenditure fixed at $155.73 with 55,554 eligible children, the LEA was alloted a maximum grant of $864,924.42 for fiscal year 1966 and $750,080.00 for fiscal year 1967: 25 of the 49 public schools in this district were situated in poverty areas and enrolled from 17 percent to 88 percent of the eligible children.

Three projects were funded for fiscal year 1966: (1) From January to June of 1966 a remedial reading program was in operation for grades 1–3. The summer program included activities for grades 1–7. (2) a multiservice program which consisted of food services, educational TV, physical education classes, and music for grades 1–12. Eligible students in grades 8–12 could take advantage of industrial arts and homemaking activities, and (3) services for handicapped children.

TABLE 26.—*LEA data, case No. M–3*

Number of children eligible	5,554
Number of public school children participating	13,879
Number of non-public-school children participating	88
Number of nonschool participants	124
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:2.54
Expenditure per participant	$61.38
Title I expenditure rank	6(17)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	10(27)

Initial contacts between the public and nonpublic sectors were made by the LEA coordinator. He spoke with non-public-school principals and solicited suggestions for projects which would meet the needs of eligible non-public-school children. Form letters were mailed to non-public-school principals informing them of projects which were being submitted for funding. Several principals acknowledged the letter and replied that they would not participate because they had very few children in need of the program.

Shared services and shared facilities were factors which contributed to the satisfactory participation of eligible non-public-school children in the remedial reading program. Some audiovisual equipment was made available to non-public-school personnel. This type of participation circumvented the problems which could have been created if busing had been required.

The multiservice project took place during the regular schoolday in the public schools. The expense of transportation and the time spent in travel accounted for the decision on the part of non-public-school administrators not to participate in this activity. Generally speaking, the necessity of travel to public schools greatly minimized non-public-school participation.

The degree of non-public-school participation in the project for handicapped children is not clear. The fiscal year 1966 evaluation report stated that 62 non-public-school children participated in this project.

The fiscal year 1967 program is a continuation of the fiscal year 1966 program with an additional activity; namely, an inservice training program for 90 public school teachers.

Dialog has strengthened communication between the two systems. Public school officials believe that the nonpublic schools have a good, but restricted, program and a qualified professional staff. The nonpublic schools are judged by public school officials as being weak in providing for the vocational needs of their students. The non-public-school personnel believe that the needs of the majority of youngsters in the public schools are very different from theirs, and that the greatest need for title I funds is in the 25 public schools in the poverty area. Participation has in no way been hampered by legal involvement.

Principals of both sectors were asked to submit test data, anecdotal records, and informal observations as evidence of pupil growth resulting from title I programs. The non-public-school principals received test scores and other data about children who had participated in the remedial program during the second half of the 1965–66 school year and during the summer sessions. The involvement of a small number of non-public-school children did not lead to any curriculum changes in the nonpublic schools.

The fiscal year 1966 evaluation report was written by the LEA coordinator and his staff. Principals of both systems saw the completed report but did not receive copies of it.

LEA officials indicated a need for additional funds in order to provide for the needs of a greater number of eligible children. Other recommendations for future projects focused on: (1) psychological services, (2) special assistance for slow learners, (3) after school study centers, (4) remedial mathematics classes, and (5) general health service programs.

Two interested citizens, a member of the local school board and the director of county welfare, recommended a greater diversity of summer programs staffed by experienced personnel. Both of these people firmly believed that all eligible children are entitled to title I assistance regardless of the type of school they attend.

CASE M–4

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case M–4 describes a local school disrtict located in an Eastern State. The organization at the local level mirrors that of the State level. Three major types of schools exist; namely, the publicly supported integrated schools, secular private segregated schools, and nonpublic church-related schools. Based on a per pupil average of $179.10, the maximum allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $30,619,294.20. Funds actually committed during that period totaled $20,889,005.

TABLE 27.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M-4*

Number of children eligible	170,962
Number of public school children participating	118,935
Number of non-public-school children participating	688
Number of nonschool participants	3,186
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.70
Expenditure per participant	$175.63
Title I expenditure rank	3(5)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	8(24)

The State requires that LEA's contact private school personnel within the district and offer them any services for which they are eligible. Such srevice as loans of equipment, inservice training, special testing, and guidance services have been accepted. The responsibility for the programs has been entirely with the LEA's. During the summer, there was a reasonable ratio of attendance of private school children in public school programs.

Although there were not "cooperative" projects in this State, public school officials experienced no particular difficulty with eligible private schools since most secular private schools refused to consider the services available under Public Law 89–10, title I. Public school officials suspect this lack of interest may be due in part to the reluctance of private school administrators to become involved with Federal aid to education. Furthermore, many private schools have not qualified by filing 441–C in connection with civil rights legislation.

It appears that State law might have played a significant role in inhibiting the participation of non-public-school children. Private school children eligible to participate in title I activities are prevented by law from being transported in public school buses to a public school for participation. Further, a title I employee cannot legally teach in a private school. Services for the private school child would be provided in the public school. In addition, the State uses a tuition grant for parents who do not desire to send their children to an integrated public school. This grant permits these children to attend nonpublic schools. Such grants, however, were not extended to the parents of children who attended Catholic schools.

Non-public-school officials at the regional and/or State level felt that the nonpublic schools were invited to participate in title I program which were geared to meet the needs of the public schools. One major problem seems to be that the needs of the nonpublic schools are not being given equal consideration with the needs of the public schools. Furthermore, the nonpublic schools were invited to participate only after the projects had been completely setup. While public school officials seemed to be willing to allow the nonpublic schools to participate in programs already planned, they did not seem willing to allow the non-public-school personnel to help in designing the projects. Finally, non-public-school officials are of the opinion that the main reason for not including a greater number of eligible non-public-school children in title I projects appeared to be the misinterpretation or the rigid interpretation of the law.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum LEA allotment under title I for fiscal year 1966 was $519,927.30. The total amount expended during that same fiscal year was $357,460.91. Three projects were funded: (1) selected reading readiness, (2) an academic, cultural, and educational enrichment program, (3) a dynamic summer program for deprived, mentally retarded children.

TABLE 28.—*LEA data, case No. M-4*

Number of children eligible	2,903
Number of public school children participating	1,799
Number of non-public-school children participating	1
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.62
Expenditure per participant	$200.02
Title I expenditure rank	4(9)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	8(24)

Public school officials at the local level felt that the Roman Catholic parochial schools showed the most interest in participating in title I activities. However, as only one nonpublic school qualified, they assumed there was little need to involve non-public-school officials in planning title I projects. Also, because of the small number of eligible non-public-school pupils, communication between public and non-public-school officials was rather infrequent, though, what did occur appeared to be fruitful. Public school officials are of the opinion that the income limitation does not allow for any great degree of participation of non-public-school children.

A non-public-school official at the local level stated that the needs of the non-public-school children were not met because their needs were not included in the planning process. In addition, there has been very little communication between public and non-public-school officials regarding title I and seldom, if ever, do public school officials initiate contacts. It appears that the times and places scheduled for title I activities, and also the lack of transportation, limited to some degree the participaion of non-public-school children.

Public school officials felt that only direct aid to non-public-school children could better meet the needs of these children. They further stated that nonpublic schools should be provided with regular classroom teacher aides and that teaching-aid materials should be made available to eligible nonpublic schools.

Non-public-school officials recommended that they be invited to participate in the planning of future projects so that the needs of non-public-school children will be given equal consideration with the needs of public school children. They would also like to have mobile units made accessible to nonpublic schools; visual equipment housed in nonpublic schools; special teachers made available to nonpublic schools in the areas of guidance, art, science, reading, and free educational TV and radio.

The field survey coordinator made the following observations:

> Although there are a number of sectarian schools located in the local school district, the only nonpublic school participating in any manner whatsoever was a Catholic parochial school. Even in this case the number participating was at best minimal. According to the public school personnel, every means was used

> to acquaint the schools with the potential invested in title I projects. Many of the secular schools did not even attempt to qualify. Only the Catholic schools actively applied and then only a small number of students qualified according to the rigid interpretation of the requirements of title I legislation. The minimum wage limit of $2,000 was used time and time again to explain the small number of eligible nonpublic students.

He went on to report:

> While cooperation was expressed to a degree between both systems, it was evident that it was of a token nature. There was a degree of respect for each other as professional educators. Knowledge of title I in its local application was confined essentially to the coordinator and the director of instruction on the local level. Nonpublic personnel seemed to be interpreting it (guidelines for title I) broadly. The interpretation was very rigid and traditional. On the State level and the local level there has been an attempt to inform the administrators, but it does not seem to have worked. There appears to have been a definite improvement in the relations between the public and the nonpublic school systems as a result of title I projects.

CASE NO. M–5

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

The county school system described in this case report is located in a North Central State. The State's maximum ESEA title I allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $18,378,029.01. Half the State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963–64 was $230.01. Basic descriptive data for the State are summarized in table 29.

TABLE 29.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M–5*

Number of children eligible	79,901
Number of public school children participating	115,904
Number of non-public-school children participating	16,233
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.65
Expenditure per participant	$131.10
Title I expenditure rank	6 (14)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	6 (14)

Steps were taken by the State educational agency to develop initiative by local administrators in contacting non-public-school officials. The SEA made attempts to encourage LEA personnel, from the very beginning of the planning of title I, to communicate and work with eligible non-public-school administrators of schools enrolling a stipulated percentage of children from low income families. These steps were reemphasized through meetings, private conversations, bulletins, and letters to the LEA coordinator. A State official has declared that in cases where non-public-school children were not included in project applications, the State department required that adjustments be made in the proposals. This same official said that title I has increased the degree of communication between public and non-public-school administrators. Almost all communications have been initiated by the public sector, but most of the response of the private sector has been immediate and positive. He also mentioned that there seemed to be a feeling that private education has not always been of high quality. Title I activities have had a positive effect.

The question of nonpublic participation has been raised with legal authorities, and a ruling is pending. However, the State attorney general appears to be in no great hurry to settle this matter. Meanwhile, the State department of education, local educational agencies, local public and non-public-school personnel are proceeding with title I activities. Only one pressure group seems to be operating. Its members are advocating more and more direct involvement of the nonpublic sector in title I activities. This group would like to write projects and to receive funds directly rather than indirectly through the public school system.

A few districts did not submit applications for title I funds. Some of these local school boards and/or administrators were hesitant about applying because they did not have the resources to satisfactorily implement potential projects. Two or three districts did not submit proposals because those responsible for such decisions harbored negative feelings toward Federal aid. Some of the districts that did not apply for title I funds in fiscal year 1966 submitted proposals in fiscal year 1967. A manpower shortage of professional educators throughout the State created a serious problem. Approved projects could not be implemented, in some cases. Others could only be implemented on a limited basis. A lack of knowledge of how to teach the educationally deprived created frustration throughout the State.

Problems experienced in developing and implementing joint projects were (1) non-public-school personnel demanded services in a greater proportion than their children should receive, (2) some non-public-school principals did not want to identify the residences of the children they deemed eligible for title I activities, (3) the superintendent of the non-public-school system communicated with agencies or persons other than the SEA and secured information which was not appropriate for this State, (4) irresponsible newspaper reporters misinformed the public about title I legislation and about local title I activities. This misinformation was carried in the daily newspaper and in the diocesan weekly newspaper.

A recommendation for revising the legislation regarding public and nonpublic participation is to make it mandatory for the nonpublic school to furnish public school officials with the names, places of residence, and special educational needs of eligible non-public-school children.

The field survey coordinator did not interview any non-public-school officials at the State or regional levels.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum LEA title I allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $493,371.45. Almost the entire amount was expended. Approximately 85 percent of the fiscal year 1966 maximum grant was authorized in fiscal year 1967.

TABLE 30.—*LEA data, case No. M–5*

Number of children eligible	2, 145
Number of public school children participating	1, 870
Number of non-public-school children participating	186
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1: 0. 96
Expenditure per participant	$239. 85
Title I expenditure rank	3 (6)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	6 (14)

Non-public-school children participated in each of the four projects conducted on the local level. The local evaluation to the State reads, in part, as follows:

> Cooperation with nonpublic schools has been rewarding. Representatives of nonpublic schools were involved in the original planning phase of title I projects. The same bulletins of information and personal contact with school personnel were employed in disseminating information on the implementation of the projects with nonpublic schools as with public schools. Participation of nonpublic pupils in the summer projects was excellent. A teacher's individual appraisal, in writing, of the achievements, attitudes, interests, and talents of each student was sent to the non-public-school principals for use in followup procedures.

When interviewed by the field survey coordinator, one non-public-school official at the local level made the following comments:

> Public school officials indicated a willingness to involve nonpublic schools in Federal programs. Non-public-school officials were not involved in the actual planning of the specific projects and were not consulted in the determination of the focus of projects. Public school officials did not ask for information regarding students who might participate in title I projects. Non-public-school personnel did identify students who were eligible to participate in the projects. Non-public-school teachers did have an opportunity to participate in inservice programs.

This same individual indicated that there is a move in the nonpublic sector to provide a position for a person who might serve as a coordinator of Federal programs. He views this as a very positive move.

The field survey coordinator has reported his general perceptions of the local title I program as follows:

> This program has been planned and implemented from the central office. As a result, only one person has an adequate overview of the total program. Principals and even project directors are not at all familiar with the title I guidelines and were hard pressed to give specific reactions to questions regarding the focus or goals of the program. These people had little information regarding the degree of participation of non-public-school children in title I projects.
>
> There are definite organizational problems in the nonpublic sector. The diocesan superintendent, after conferring with State department personnel, determined that the situation called for local rather than State or regional direction. Thus the local non-public-school principal was designated as the contact person for Federal programs. This principal, however, has a full-time job running an understaffed high school and does not have the same authority over principals which a local superintendent of schools would have. This is not to say that the various non-public-school principals do not cooperate but rather that the high school principal has been given the responsibility for coordinating Federal programs without the authority to do so.
>
> The nonpublic high school principal mentioned that there had been talk regarding the appointment of a diocesan coordinator of Federal programs. While this would certainly be better than the present situation, it would still leave much to be desired. Attempting to coordinate programs in one city of the State from a central office in another city of the State would present a number of problems. Such problems would, of course, be compounded by attempts to coordinate programs in other counties and cities located within the diocesan boundaries.

The field survey coordinator went on to report:

> A word of explanation as to why I talked only to the high school principal is in order at this point. When my trip was planned, a series of meetings were set up with several non-public-school people. However, the high school principal met with the elementary school principals, and they decided that they should not meet with me because they were not involved in title I programs. In fact, he wished to talk to me primarily to find out why nonpublic schools in the local

area were not participating in title I programs. Obviously, there seemed to be a severe breakdown in communications between the public and nonpublic sectors. During the first half of the interview with the nonpublic high school principal, I told him how nonpublic schools at the local level were participating. Needless to say, this was somewhat ridiculous. Non-public-school personnel were under the impression that they were participating under title II of ESEA.

If it is fair to say that most public school personnel, with the exception of one or two people from the central office people, are not familiar with ESEA guidelines and purposes, then it is also fair to say that non-public-school personnel are almost totally ignorant of the specifics of these programs.

CASE M-6

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case M-6 involves a medium school system of a Midwest State located in the Central United States below the Great Lakes. The maximum amount authorized to this State under title I in fiscal year 1966 was $61,095,946.88. The total number of public school students participating in title I on a statewide basis was not available, but the total number of nonpublic students was given as 124,927 (duplicated count).

TABLE 31.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M-6*

Number of children eligible	242,911
Number of public school children participating	217,112
Number of non-public-school children participating	23,790
Number of nonschool participants	2,009
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.54
Expenditure per participant	$181.92
Title I expenditure rank	2(3)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	2(3)

The basic allocation was made on a county basis, and $265.91 was allocated for each child qualifying under title I. An arrangement was worked out to allow for school districts that overlapped county boundaries. Non-public-school children were not figured in the SEA calculations; the State has no information concerning expenditure in nonpublic schools. In fiscal year 1966, about 66 percent of the State maximum basic grant was used.

County data	Grades	Enrollment	Maximum amount authorized
1. District in case study	Kindergarten to 12	19,700	$461,633.00
2. 10 other school districts	do	6,500	144,671.58
Total			606,304.58

The total number of children eligible for title I in the county was 2,282.

The SEA, before it approved a grant, determined that the LEA had provided sufficient opportunities for the participation of educationally deprived children residing in the district who are enrolled in nonpublic schools. Non-public-school participation was encouraged by the SEA through guidelines, local conferences, and State meetings with public- and non-public-school administrators at the State level. The SEA officially recommends "that planning committees be set up (at the local level) including parochial school representatives, in advance of all project writing."

The State was divided on a county line basis into nine regions. A title I regional supervisor was assigned to service each of these regions, with the exception of the large metropolitan areas where two supervisors were assigned. The title I staff held seven regional workshops covering the State in the summer of 1965.

The needs identified on a statewide basis: reading, language arts, study skills, and library use. Reading improvement programs accounted for approximately 70 percent of the compensatory educational activities in this State.

The most serious deterrent in the development of an effective and efficient statewide program for title I was the acute shortage of personnel: administrative, general teaching, and specialists.

Article VIII, section 3, of the State constitution prohibits public school employees from teaching on the premises of a nonpublic school. Mobile educational equipment may be placed on the premises of a nonpublic school on a loan basis. No wiring, construction, or attached fixtures can be approved. Work-study programs for non-public-school students have not been approved in this State.

The State holds that mobile units are legal as long as they are used for both public and nonpublic schools. A unit may not serve nonpublic schools only.

Catholic officials are disturbed by a ruling barring services and equipment from nonpublic premises. The diocesan director of Catholic schools testified to this opinion, and Catholic officials "wonder why he (the Attorney General) has not ruled on the question." There is a popular conception, especially on the local level, that the Attorney General made this ruling. This is not true; it was a ruling of the legal counsel to the SEA.

The State director of title I and six regional supervisors for the SEA were involved in the review and approval of fiscal year 1966 applications. There were changes in the process for fiscal year 1967, but non-public-school officials did not participate in the reviewing process.

All LEA project applications were studied for the inclusion of non-public-school students. In areas where the SEA has received complaints from non-public-school leaders, the SEA has held "conferences both with people from public and nonpublic schools to iron out the problems."

A regional non-public-school official considered title I information from the State level incomplete and unclear. The diocesan director for Catholic schools claimed: "The State never makes completely clear exactly what is permissible and what is not, and reasons for decisions are not always given."

Before 1964 there was little or no contact between public- and non-public-school officials at the State level. Since 1964, there has been much more extensive involvement. The relationship between the public and nonpublic educators was described as "generally good" by a SEA official. The non-public-school officials felt that the "State is becoming a little more helpful and informative as time goes on." The appointment of one individual to the SEA title I office, completely in charge of the relationship with nonpublic schools, is presently being considered by the SEA. This is a good and constructive step as far as the non-public-school officials are concerned. As for the present situation, non-public-school officials have been successful in getting various kinds of information from the SEA. There is some suggestion that Catholic educators feel "brushed off" by the State officials. Catholic officials are convinced that the SEA personnel do not understand the Catholic school system.

The public sector initiated communications with nonpublic officials at the State level, but public school officials at the local level are more willing to involve nonpublic officials in the title I program than those at the State level. Information has been sent to non-public-school officials intermittently, but according to the diocesan director, "We have had to take the initiative on several occasions in seeking necessary information, and our efforts have frequently been unsuccessful."

The LEA involved in this case, according to the Catholic diocesan director, does not reflect the typical interaction between public- and non-public-school personnel in this region. Outside this county, the picture in the diocese is much less favorable, especially in some rural areas. In some areas, nonpublic schools have been completely ignored.

The diocesan director maintained that the State ruling on non-public-school children's participation in title I projects is the major problem in carrying out the intent of the law. Other criticisms were directed to a lack of clear information from the SEA, and a tendency to put too much title I money into administrative salaries, and not enough into the title I programs themselves.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The title I program is essentially composed of reading, art, speech therapy, music, corrective physical education, and cultural enrichment aspects, with additional psychological, social, counseling, and diagnostic services available. The program was designed to improve the educational and cultural aspirations of individuals residing in an area of heavy concentration of social problems and poverty. The main objective of the project was to change the self concepts and raise the levels of aspiration of the individuals within the project area. This target area included the major concentration of disadvantaged children, although other "pockets" of disadvantaged children are to be found in other parts of the community.

The school district contains schools of very widely separated socio-economic backgrounds. About 25 percent of the school population is in the project area where most of the children fall within the definition of culturally deprived. The severe learning problems in the county are predominantly confined within the project area. The title I program for fiscal year 1967 was a continuation of the fiscal year 1966 program with little or no change.

The title I program was focused on 13 schools in the district, including four nonpublic schools:

School	Total enrollment	Grades	Percent economically deprived [1]	Number of economically deprived [1]	Number of educationally deprived [1]
Public:					
1	475	Kindergarten to 6			
2	699	do			
3	393	do			
4	321	do			
5	374	do			
6	676	do			
7	542	do			
8	911	7 to 9			
9	881	10 to 12			
Total	5,272				
atholic:					
10	412	1 to 8			
11	299	do			
12	324	do			
Total	1,035				
13 Lutheran	93	1 to 8			
Total	6,400				

[1] Not available.

TABLE 32.—*LEA data, case No. M–6*

Number of children eligible	1,737
Number of public school children participating	4,318
Number of non-public-school children participating	1,128
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:2.02
Expenditure per participant	$66.00
Title I expenditure rank	9 (28)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	2 (3)

The fiscal year 1966 project began on January 31, 1966, and ended August 15, 1966.

The maximum basic grant (fiscal year 1966) for the LEA was $461,633. The amount actually expended in 1966 was $361,884.67, leaving $99,748.12 in unused funds.

The program took place during the regular school day, on public or other than non-public-school grounds. Catholic school students participated in the reading and speech services, and the Lutheran school students in the reading class.

The entire title I program of this community, as it affected nonpublic schools, was worked out cooperatively with the officials from nonpublic schools. At least six planning sessions for the title I proposal were held in fiscal year 1966 at which the diocesan director of Catholic schools was in attendance. At least one Lutheran representative also attended.

The office of the superintendent of public schools invited the Catholic diocesan director, the Catholic school principals, and a Lutheran school principal from the target area to meet late in 1965 to react to ideas and to propose their needs. There were several other subsequent meetings. The Catholic school personnel suggested a number of needs and all their proposals were incorporated into the first draft of the title I document. The Catholic school authorities requested a mobile unit with equipment for speech therapy, remedial math, and remedial reading; and the Lutheran school suggested an accelerated reading class. Initially, some services on the premises of nonpublic schools were planned, and the local school board attorney regarded all of these requests to be legal. The local board was moving ahead on these ideas, but the State suddenly turned down a number of these ideas "without explanation." Non-public-school officials were never able to obtain a satisfactory clarification from the SEA. One non-public-school official commented, "State authorities kept saying that if we pushed these ideas we would end up getting nothing; so we decided to settle for what we could get." All of the non-public-school officials felt that there was ample opportunity for non-public-school personnel to contribute ideas to the program at the local level. Local public school officials were open to ideas and considered them fairly and thoroughly.

When the first plans were turned down by the State, the non-public-school officials were involved in efforts to set up alternative plans. The solution provided a flexible bus service to transport non-public-school students to and from the public schools. There was confusion over the legal wording used in the application. Some non-public-school officials feel that some of the original ideas would have obtained SEA approval if the proper wording had been employed, "because the same things have been done elsewhere in the State." The public school officials at the local level "seemed as much in the dark" as their non-public-school counterparts concerning the State guidelines for title I.

Non-public-school personnel were not included in the inservice programs for teachers of title I, because none of these teachers are title I staff members.

Operations for fiscal year 1966 did not get underway until February 1966, in great part due to delays in processing the proposals. For all practical purposes, the fiscal year 1966 program has been continued for fiscal year 1967, but a cutback to about 80 percent of the level of funding in fiscal year 1966 occurred in fiscal year 1967.

Due to statutory limitations project activities could not be ideally timed and located for non-public-school students. Within the framework of that limitation, public school officials have been flexible and adaptive in scheduling the activities to meet the needs of the non-public-school students. In fiscal year 1966 no bus service was available. Non-public-school officials stated that they would not have their students participate in fiscal year 1967 if bus service was not arranged. A nine-passenger bus was purchased with title I funds and is operating. A non-public-school principal commented, "The public school officials go out of their way to adapt to our schedule." An elaborate busing service was established so that non-public-school students could be transported to virtually any activity at any time in the title I program without losing more than 10 to 15 minutes of time, overall, in transit.

Non-public-school students have participated extensively in all programs offered under title I. Some testing services to screen pupils for title I, and health services were provided on the premises of nonpublic schools. This was illegal in terms of the State policy, but the "public school people quietly went ahead."

Special services for nonpublic schools which were made available included a remedial reading teacher, a remedial speech teacher, and a correctionist for perceptual and motor deficiencies (non-public-school grounds). These were not offered to nonpublic schools during the summer, but the "umbrella program" (cultural enrichment) was maintained for non-public-school students. A lack of qualified personnel in the title I program was not a problem in this community, although this proved to be a prevalent problem throughout the State.

Before title I, the relationship between public and non-public-school personnel was "cordial," but there was little contact between them. A new superintendent of public schools in the school district has contributed to this change. As the title I coordinator explained, he "has gone out of his way to develop rapport with the strong Catholic element in the community." There is close cooperation and continuous contact between public and non-public-school personnel particularly at the teacher level, though also at the principal level. There have been no complaints from non-public-school principals, teachers, or parents, concerning the title I program. The policy that frequent contact is valuable and important eminates from the superintendent to the entire school system at every level. The feeling prevails that everyone will gain if cooperative arrangements are established.

There is no formal mechanism for regular contact between public and non-public-school personnel at the level of local administration, but non-public-school officials are free to present complaints or suggestions at any time.

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in the project evaluation. All evaluation was based on data gathered by public school personnel who administered the programs. Many non-public-school personnel did not realize that an evaluation of the title I program had been made.

Public school officials expressed a desire to provide non-public-school personnel with certain critical equipment and supplies that have been provided in public schools under title I. Also, they would like to establish a "cooperative teacher" program to provide non-public-school teachers with assistant teachers and, in addition, folding partitions to help cut down on the large class size that exist in nonpublic schools. (All of these are prohibited by State law.)

All public and non-public-school personnel recommended that the State ruling be reversed. They referred to it as "stupid" and "ridiculous." They could work more efficiently, flexibily, and economically without this legal encumbrance. It is important to note that every official on the local level, both public and nonpublic, including the superintendent and the coordinator of title I, were under the impression that the legal decision involving title I was the result of a ruling by the Attorney General. As it is evident in the State description, this is not the case.

Non-public-school officials expressed a need for semimobile equipment to bring remedial instruments and services to the non-public-school premises, public school personnel to teach and conduct services in nonpublic schools, and a center to provide instructional films, audiovisual materials, equipment, et cetera. They criticized the lack of information and unjustifiable rulings at the State level.

The Catholic educational sector also expressed a need for an individual within their educational organization who would be assigned full time to work with title I at the Federal, State, and local levels. The diocesan director does not have enough assistance, with the result that Catholic school principlas are not kept adequately informed, and constant contact is not maintained.

CASE M-7

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This is a Southern State which borders on the Gulf of Mexico. The county and the local school system are located in the northwest corner of the State. The local school system is of medium size. The maximum amount authorized for this State under title I for fiscal year 1966 was $38,344,221. The amount of funds actually committed was $24,320,105.16. One-half State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963-64 was $190.50.

TABLE 33.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M-7*

Number of children eligible	201, 282
Number of public school children participating	134, 075
Number of non-public-school children participating	4, 797
Number of nonschool participants	687
Eligible: Participant ratio	1: 1.44
Expenditure per participant	$175. 12
Title I expenditure rank	4(6)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	7(21)

The State interim report of December 1965 states that all local educational agencies have been advised by the State education agency to contact the private school officials in their localities so that the private schoolchildren eligible for title I services will be given the opportunity to participate in the programs. This State is unique in that public school officials have had good relations with private schools for years.

The State evaluation report for fiscal year 1966 states that, of the 67 LEA's in the State, only 41 were eligible to participate in title I. Only 38 chose to participate. The report also states that the nonpublic schools of this States were found not to be in compliance with the provision of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and by virtue of this, were not eligible for participation in title I programs. However, some of the LEA's provided activities during the summer in which children participated who normally attended the nonpublic schools during the regular school session.

The field survey coordinator did not interview any school official—either public or nonpublic—at the State or regional level.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum amount authorized for the county for fiscal year 1966 was $2,043,112.50. The total number of eligible children for the county was 11,332. The county and the local school system are coterminous.

TABLE 34.—*LEA data, case No. M-7*

Number of children eligible	11, 332
Number of public school children participating	10, 721
Number of non-public-school children participating	611
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1: 1.00
Expenditure per participant	$170. 00
Title I expenditure rank	5(12)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	7(21)

The field survey coordinator did not interview any non-public-school officials at the local level. The perceptions of the public school officials who were interviewed are as follows:

The public school sector at the local level reports that letters were sent to the nonpublic schools which were eligible to participate. Two orientation meetings were held. January 16, 1967, was the date of the last meeting held. In addition to these meetings, there has been occasional telephone conversation.

The nonpublic sector is very anxious and wants to participate. Representatives of the nonpublic sector were not involved in planning projects. They were informed of what would take place. The nonpublic sector was in on the discussions but had no voice when it came to forming policies nor did the nonpublic sector have any voice in determining the final focus of title I programs.

The parochial school officials were asked to furnish data concerning their students and this data was made available as requested. The Census Department of the LEA keeps this census data. The Census Bureau receives periodic reports from the diocese.

The summer 1966 workshop for kindergarten teachers was on a fee basis. Parochial school people did not attend. Parochial school people were invited to attend an inservice meeting but did not attend this either.

There is an exchange of grades and progress reports resulting from the summer school enrichment program and the kindergarten program.

Since parochial school children are in school at the same time as those in the public schools, they only participate in the after-school program, the kindergarten program, and the summer program. The after-school library hours make it possible for parochial school youngsters to participate. There is also an after-hour physical educational program. The parochial school youngsters were also invited to participate in the cultural improvement program. Due to school hours, the after-school program is the most popular.

The summer schools operated on a fee basis in 1965. In 1966, there were no fees in target schools. This provided for a wider participation.

Health examinations and services were extended to all who attended the kindergarten program. Readiness tests, pre- and post-tests, were given. Counselors were available on an individual basis. There have been adjustments in the first-grade program due to a better readiness in pupils going through the kindergarten experience.

No activities were carried out in nonpublic schools. No public school personnel were assigned to nonpublic schools.

The State evaluation report for fiscal year 1966 mentions a spring and summer enrichment program conducted in the LEA. Students from qualifying schools were transported to the civic auditorium in a nearby city where they observed and heard a full-scale symphony orchestra. Concerts were provided by the city's symphony society in junior and senior high schools with a smaller, but complete, symphony orchestra. During these concerts, there were instrumental solos as well as excerpts from the standard operas. The symphony conductor made appropriate comments during these performance pertaining to the musical instruments used by members of the orchestra, the musical selections presented, and other areas in connection with units of work being studied by students in the music curriculum.

Prior to each concert, students were briefed by their classroom teachers, and librettos of operas were reviewed. After attending the performances, discussions were generated in the classroom so that the children could express their reactions and so that the programs would have a more lasting effect on the children.

Since this project component was well received, not only by participating youngsters but also by their parents, who also attended some of the performances, the fiscal year 1967 project from the LEA includes this cultural enrichment activity.

Local public school principals report that, although parochial school students are not making use of the services available at the present time, they (the local public school principals) are aware that the nonpublic-school youngsters are eligible if they wish to participate.

The local coordinator of title I states that library and audiovisual equipment has been held in escrow because the diocese has been ruled as not in compliance with Federal guidelines.

The nonpublic sector was involved to the extent that questionnaires were sent out regarding kindergarten pupils who were in their first year of school. Health records were also made available. Progress reports were also sent on each summer school participant. The nonpublic sector reviewed applicable parts of project evaluation reports before they were submitted to the State department of education. The nonpublic sector was not sent copies of the evaluation reports but had access to them if they desired the information.

Evaluation procedures were hampered since the school systems were not using the same testing program. It was very difficult to measure student progress since pretest scores were based on different tests.

Title I projects were very effective in meeting the needs of public school youngsters. There has not been too much participation on the part of parochial school youngsters.

Test scores and other data have been sent to appropriate schools. The public sector is not aware of any changes in educational practices in nonpublic schools since the nonpublic sector has been only minimally involved in title I activities.

The public sector would like to see the program continue as it now exists. They feel the program is best operated through the public schools. They feel that there is a need for a more cooperative attitude on the part of the non-public-school personnel toward the program already provided in the public schools.

The public sector feels that the different philosophy between the public and nonpublic sector has adversely influenced the participation of non-public-school students in title I activities. Also, many economic situations face the parochial schools that are quite different from those in the public schools.

As relates to quality of personnel the public schools call for a better level of instruction and better training qualifications on the part of their teachers. The feeling expressed was that the parochial schools would prefer to remain parochial schools rather than join in a participation with the public schools.

The public sector states that communication has been helpful but there is still a long way to go.

The public sector recommends that the Headstart program, now under the community action program, could be more effectively handled in the public schools and under the auspices of the board of education. The work could be better accomplished if placed in the hands of qualified personnel.

The executive director of the community action program has reported that he could not have a Headstart program in the public schools because the LEA school board did not wish to participate in this Federal program. However, he has had good cooperation with the parochial schools. He feels that title I funds are not being wisely used in some cases. They are being spent on some wealthy children that don't need the help. He feels that title I should be channeled through the existing public school structure rather than being implemented in parochial schools by parochial school people. He feels that too many programs now exist. There needs to be more cooperation and a clearer understanding of who is doing what. Everyone seems to be going in a different direction.

The field survey coordinator states that there has been very little change between the first and second year of operation. He feels that although no real change has taken place in the operation of the program, the lines of communication have opened considerably and it is felt that more progress is forthcoming.

We have only been able to obtain the perceptions of the public sector regarding title I activities in this State. The main factor appears to be that the nonpublic sector has not complied with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and hence cannot participate in title I activities.

CASE M-8

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case M-8 is a medium school system in the southwest section of a northwest State. The maximum amount authorized to this State under title I in fiscal year 1966 was $2,446,630.16. The SEA did not allocate title I money on a county basis, but provided a breakdown by unified school districts in determining the amount of money available to the LEA. The 1963-64 State average per pupil expenditure figures were not used by the SEA, and students enrolled in nonpublic schools were not included in the calculation. The State title I director has only been in office 7 months, and his predecessor was not available to provide necessary information.

TABLE 35.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M-8*

Number of children eligible	14,087
Number of public school children participating	21,757
Number of non-public-school children participating	2,368
Number of non-school participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.71
Expenditure per participant	$99.39
Title I expenditure rank	7 (23)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	9 (25)

Approximately 98 percent of the maximum basic grant was expended in fiscal year 1966; the figures for fiscal year 1967 were not available, but the director thought that the figure "might have increased in the second year."

The SEA, in accordance with the Federal guidelines, required each LEA to inform the nonpublic schools in the school district about title I. But this regulation does not seem to have been effectively enforced. SEA policy toward non-public-school involvement is vague, due to the ambiguity in the interpretation of the State law relative to title I.

Throughout the State, title I projects were established in public school facilities only.

Article IX, section V, of the constitution of this State prohibits the use of State money for any sectarian purpose. Title I funds may be used for students in nonpublic schools, but not in any way for the school itself. The attorney general delivered an opinion that it is permissible for public schools to provide opportunities for dual enrollment.

According to a policy statement of the SEA, "There has been no question in this State to date (December 2, 1966), on the legality of the State's fiscal year 1966 title I operation." Title I funds, under existing State law, may be used to transport non-public-school children to and from the LEA. As a statewide policy, "the practice of LEA's using title I funds to provide special services by sending an employee to the premises of the nonpublic schools is not advocated" by the SEA. Activities involving non-public-school personnel, and work-study programs in nonpublic schools are permissible, but implementation is up to the discretion of the LEA.

The use of title I funds by LEA's to place equipment on a loan basis on the premises of nonpublic school, or to provide inservice training to nonpublic school teachers who have a specific title I assignment, is advocated by the SEA, and is being practiced in the State. To a large degree, the involvement of nonpublic schools in title I is left to the discretion of the LEA.

The deputy State superintendent, who is in charge of all Federal programs, and one full-time consultant reviewed and approved fiscal year 1966 applications. SEA consultants in specialized areas and university consultants were also included in the final procedure. Nonpublic school officials were not invited by the SEA to review or endorse applications.

The SEA title I director explained that on a statewide basis, no nonpublic schools were "intentionally excluded" from title I programs, but the State school law leaves nonpublic participation in title I vaguely explained, and as a result "no one has been certain how to proceed."

The SEA required the LEA's to notify the nonpublic schools about title I programs, but the title I director explained, "I am not sure that they did so, that they really took the program to the nonpublic schools." He pointed out some particular Seventh-day Adventist, Quaker, and Lutheran, and some Catholic schools are not "participating in title I, not at all." Measures advocated to insure nonpublic participation by the SEA are not uniformly enforced by the State authorities, "because it all depends on the local situation." In some communities in the State, where Catholics constitute the majority, measures are quite successful in including nonpublic school children in title I, but in other localities, the director stated that "probably nothing is being done."

The Catholic diocesan superintendent described the SEA as being quite willing to involve nonpublic school officials in title I. "They (SEA) really want to cooperate." The local school district of this case study reflects a spirit of cooperation, but it does not represent the typical interaction between public and nonpublic officials throughout the State. The degree of cooperation varies in separate segments of the State.

The relationship between the SEA and the chief nonpublic officials "could not be better" according to the Catholic diocesan superintendent. The title I director described the atmosphere as "cordial," but he also expressed the opinion at first that the non-public-school officials were suspicious of the SEA and of the title I program. Both agreed that there was no appreciable difference in the public-nonpublic relationship at the State level because of title I. Communication has remained the same. The preexisting mutual friendship "of public and nonpublic school personnel was seen as facilitating communication about title I activities."

The SEA title I director expressed respect for the diocesan superintendent ("One of the most knowledgeable educators in the State") and the Catholic school system. The diocesan superintendent states that SEA officials have done the best they could, under the State constitution, in involving nonpublic schools in title I. He established the rulings of the Attorney General as the main factor inhibiting the participation of nonpublic schools, and he expressed the opinion that the "Attorney General both should and could be more liberal in his interpretation" of the State constitution.

Despite the apparently good interpersonal relations between State education officials and the diocesan superintendent, the field survey coordinator expressed the judgment that: "There is not title I aid worth the name being provided the nonpublic schools by the public schools. The diocesan superintendent of schools patently does not want to rock the boat, and does not want any outside interviewer to rock the boat for him by asking questions that might be embarrassing or upsetting to anyone. He is quite amiable, seems very intelligent, and may be quite right in his handling of his own situation; he is one who must live with it. Possibly he expects the public schools to realize their obligation later and provide title I aid without his having to damage his relationship with them by prodding them."

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The fiscal year 1966 title I project provided special education and audiovisual instruction for the educationally disadvantaged; also, teacher aids were employed and equipment was purchased in order to expand the audiovisual programs for low achievers in grades 7–12.

The title I program was focused on 10 public schools in the school districts; no students from nonpublic schools were included in the title I program.

The planning and administrative preparation took place between November 1965 and January 1966. The fiscal year 1966 project was carried out between February 1966 and August 31, 1966. The fiscal year 1967 project took place between September 1966 and June 1967. The maximum basic grant (fiscal year 1966) for the LEA was $206,679.20. Approximately $112,000 was spent on audiovisual and other equipment. The average per pupil expenditure for 1965–66 was $405.08. The maximum basic grant (fiscal year 1967) was $212,007. ($84,458/teacher aids; $74,470/special education: $53,079/reading improvement programs).

Table 36.—LEA data, case No. M–8

Number of children eligible	1,189
Number of public school children participating	6,238
Number of non-public-school children participating	0
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.25
Expenditure per participant	$33.00
Title I expenditure rank	10 (30)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	9 (25)

In the fiscal year 1966 application LEA officials state, "The number of nonpublic school children cannot be determined at this time, but they will be provided an opportunity to participate as the project progresses."

The title I project took place on public school grounds during the regular school day.

For both the fiscal year 1966 and 1967 "all private schools have been notified by letter of the project and the availability of these services insofar as provided by the constitution of the State." This was the only explanation of the steps taken to involve the nonpublic schools in title I. In a letter from a consultant sent to the USOE, it was stated that "the project director said that he received no answers from the private schools for title I. He said they are participating in title II."

No orientation was provided by the LEA for non-public-school personnel. The title I coordinator explained, "I talked with my superintendent about this. We didn't think any was necessary." The public school sector did not receive any response from non-public-school personnel to the letter announcing title I. Non-public-school officials were not consulted and were not involved in the planning phases because "when we first started we didn't know whether non-public-school children would be eligible, so we didn't include anyone from their schools." The LEA coordinator was aware that the non-public-school students with "learning troubles" were sent to the public school, an elementary remedial school, "so we just presumed that all children who had trouble learning were already in public schools." The principal of this remedial school has "absolutely no contact with the nonpublic schools." He had no knowledge of the nonpublic schools whatsoever.

The climate for cooperation between public and nonpublic schools in this community was described as "unofficial, but friendly" by a public school principal. Respect was expressed by public school personnel for the Catholic school system and, in particular, the diocesan superintendent.

A non-public-school principal described the climate as "friendly," but admitted there is little contact between public and non-public-school personnel. Title I has not changed the situation in any way. This principal "did not realize that the public schools had any title I projects."

The diocesan superintendent asserted that the problem had to do "with Federal money, and not at all to do with the public—non-public-school issue."

The LEA title I coordinator wanted to know why his community was selected for this study. "Weren't we selected because they (Boston College) know we do not have any Catholic participation? Our reports all say that, and those reports are already in the U.S. Office of Education. This study being conducted by Boston College just makes me suspicious." The field survey coordinator tried to reassure the title I coordinator that the community was selected by size and region, but otherwise, at random. "He gave up the blistering attack, but appeared unconvinced." The mood of suspicion was also conveyed by the diocesan superintendent. He wondered whether this study was an investigation of some kind, since it had Federal sponsorship. He was "guarded" throughout the interview.

When the field survey coordinator first asked the diocesan superintendent for permission to interview principals, the superintendent expressed the opinion that they were quite busy and rather strongly implied that the coordinator should interview only one school principal, since the information would be the same. "At that point I acceded to the request, but of course it is now clear that I blundered, and there is no opportunity to recover."

The title I coordinator, when interviewed, rambled 10 minutes about meetings in the State a couple of years ago, and hinted about several conversations he had with the USOE personnel who attended the meeting; "* * * not secret, but kind of off the record." The tenor of these private conversations was that the parochial school issue had to be handled in a certain way or there would be trouble, he alleges. Apparently the coordinator feels that the USOE people were telling him how to submit title I applications so that nonpublic participation would be minimal and still be within the letter of the law. What he made clear to the field survey coordinator was that at least he, and probably the entire central office public school administration, will not act to establish any title I programs in which non-public-school children can participate except what is essential to avoid legal censure and public stress and strain. The diocesan school superintendent evidently is aware of the tactic and he is anxious about the people coming in from the outside asking questions. He wants to play it cool.

CASE M-9

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This State is located in the western part of the United States. The local school system is of medium size and is situated in the northwest section of the State. The maximum amount of funds under title I authorized for the State for fiscal year 1966 was $949,969.35. The amount of funds actually committed was $701,566.86. One-half State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963–64 was $243.27.

TABLE 37.—*SEA basic State data, case No. M-9*

Number of children eligible	3,905
Number of public school children participating	7,262
Number of nonpublic school children participating	41
Number of nonschool participants	5
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.87
Expenditure per participant	$95.99
Title I expenditure rank	8(24)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	5(11)

The interim report of 1965 states that all public school officials have been contacted in regard to conferring with private school officials, and in all cases where private schools exist, this has been done and good cooperation has been obtained.

The State evaluation report to the USOE states that, of the 10 LEA title I ESEA applicants, only five have nonpublic schools operating within their districts. The districts reported the following methods of involving non-public-school officials:

	Districts
Letter contact only	3
Joint meetings with public and nonpublic school officials to discuss participation in existing projects	3
Joint meetings with public and nonpublic school officials for the development and implementation of cooperative projects	1

Only two of the LEA's indicated any problems encountered in developing cooperative projects with nonpublic schools. One district reported that after discussing the program with the non-public-school personnel, the non-public-school administrator declined the cooperative endeavor on the grounds that it violated their belief in separation of church and state. The other district reported that the non-public-school representatives showed little interest in the program.

The State title I office, through guidelines and interpretations, had made local districts aware of the implications of Attorney General's opinions. However, due to the structure of LEA's in this State, the State title I office has not found it necessary to publish guidelines or criteria to expedite the implementation of programs. Direct, onsite consultative service negates possible misunderstandings resulting from written guidelines and regulations.

The State title I director states that allocations of funds were made on a county basis since school districts are established on county lines in this State. This same official states that the local level is the place where contacts should be made. However, one State program was established whereby nonpublic personnel and public school superintendents were oriented on all Federal programs.

One major problem appears to be an Attorney General's ruling which will not allow nonpublic schools to send their children to public school programs where the funding of any part of the program (building space, teacher salaries, materials, etc.) is State rather than Federal. Likewise, teachers and counselors cannot be sent into nonpublic schools unless the program is completely funded with Federal moneys. This ruling by the Attorney General cannot help but have a significant adverse effect on the participation of non-public-school children in title I activities.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The maximum funds authorized for the county was $197,291.97. The total number of eligible children for the county was 811. The county and the local school system are coterminous.

TABLE 38.—*LEA data, case No. M-9*

Number of children eligible	811
Number of public school children participating	1,157
Number of non-public-school children participating	35
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.47
Expenditure per participant	$137.39
Title I expenditure rank	7(19)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	5(11)

The superintendent of the county school district could not attend the interview with our field survey coordinator and thus we cannot make any report on his perceptions.

The educational projects coordinator has reported his perceptions as follows: The public sector kept the nonpublic sector advised concerning title I purposes and activities and invited their participation. However, the nonpublic sector, to a large extent, did not participate. This same official states that the nonpublic sector showed very little interest in becoming involved in title I activities. Project descriptions were presented to superintendents of nonpublic schools and their participation was invited. However, the non-public-school superintendents merely relayed this information to their school principals and left it there. Further, the nonpublic sector was invited to participate in planning projects but they did not participate. Although the public sector requested, time and time again, data about the non-public-school children, no data were forthcoming from the nonpublic sector. In only one instance were non-public-school personnel included in an inservice program for teachers of title I children.

A local public school principal states that while the non-public-school people were welcome to attend orientation activities for title I, they were not asked to attend these activities.

A second public school principal states that there were no orientation activities at the LEA level.

The superintendent of Catholic schools states that there were no orientation activities and that non-public-school officials were not consulted about the needs of non-public-school children. Further, representatives of the nonpublic sector were not involved in planning projects.

Two local non-public-school principals state that there was no involvement of local non-public-school officials in the orientation and planning of projects.

The educational projects coordinator states that activities were scheduled at times and places convenient for non-public-school children. He states that after-school learning centers and the summer remedial clinic was certainly available. Some programs had appeal but most children in the nonpublic schools are on a higher socioeconomic level than title I children. No activities were conducted in nonpublic schools. Public school personnel were not assigned to nonpublic schools. This same official states that, "We invited the nonpublic sector to participate and we don't know why some of them didn't."

A local public school principal states that the lack of contact and initiative by the nonpublic schools are the main deterrents to participation of the nonpublic sector.

The superintendent of Catholic schools feels that the lack of notification has hindered the participation of the nonpublic sector.

Two local non-public-school principals state that communication between the public and the nonpublic sector is the basic problem. Neither principal knows where or when title I activities were scheduled.

The educational projects coordinator states that the nonpublic sector was not involved in project evaluations nor did they review these reports before they were submitted to the State department of education. In fact, he asked the question, "Do they need to?" Nonpublic schools did not receive copies of these evaluation reports. On the other hand, test scores and other data on non-public-school children, who participated in title I projects, have been forwarded to their respective schools.

Local public school principals were not involved in evaluation of title I projects and "don't know anything about evaluation."

The nonpublic sector claims no knowledge of project evaluations since they were not effective in meeting the needs of non-public-school students, because the nonpublic sector was not sufficiently involved in title I activities. This same official also stated that test scores and other data on non-public-school children who participated in title I projects were brought to the nonpublic schools by parents and were not forwarded by the public sector.

The educational projects director states that they have had only one statewide title I conference and that there was no evidence of parochial school involvement. They should become more involved and it might be desirable to have a 2-week workshop with more direction from the U.S. Office of Education. Another recommendation is that regional meetings, which transcend State boundaries, should be held.

Local public school officials state that they don't know the needs of the nonpublic sector. It is up to the nonpublic sector to determine their own needs and to show more initiative. These public officials further recommend that the nonpublic sector should write its own proposals and submit its own applications.

The nonpublic sector recommends more communication between the public and nonpublic sectors; there should be more information on both sides. The public sector should be asked to attend meetings where information can be obtained. There should be more contact between the public and nonpublic sector.

One interested citizen has stated that he favors separation of church and state. He would prefer not to see title I involving nonpublic schools since he prefers complete separation of church and state. The citizen feels satisfied with the present operation of title I activities in the local district.

CASE M-10

The school system described in this case study is located in a Northwestern State which was authorized a maximum allotment of $10,693,883.81 for fiscal year 1966. One-half of the 1963-64 State average expenditure was $205.93. About 98.2 percent of the maximum was expended in fiscal year 1966.

TABLE 39.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. M-10*

Number of children eligible	42,617
Number of public school children participating	276,613
Number of non-public-school children participating	9,266
Number of nonschool participants	28,645
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:7.48
Expenditure per participant	$32.94
Title I expenditure rank	10 (30)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	4 (10)

The most pressing needs that title I projects were designed to meet were the low-grade-level performance in reading and in other skills (language, mathematics) on a statewide basis.

The Attorney General ruled that Federal money, including title I money, is not State tax money and therefore can be spent on non-public-school programs. It would be illegal to spend tax money from the State on non-public-school children.

The State title I coordinator felt that the State constitution might "potentially" prohibit the use of title I funds for non-public-school children, but there are no litigations involving title I in the State.

The Federal programs director for the State and the supervisors of guidance for the State department were involved in the review and approval of fiscal year 1966 applications. Non-public-school officials were not invited by personnel at the State level to review or endorse any applications prior to approval, nor were they involved in evaluation procedures at the State level. The policy of the State department relative to the exclusion of non-public-school children for title I project applications was stated by the title I coordinator: "Applications simply are not approved unless non-public-school children are included."

The State department of education held early exploration and planning meetings in the fall of 1965. Both public and nonpublic school officials attended. A non-public-school official, who acted as "contact man" between public and nonpublic personnel during the planning phases of all Federal programs which affect non-public-school children, found them "quite helpful." The State superintendent and his staff encouraged school districts to contact non-public-school people and involve them in the planning of the program.

This LEA was described by a nonpublic official on the State level as "fairly typical" of the interaction between public and non-public-school personnel in this area, "Although there are some places where the feeling is not as good as it is there."

The relationship between the State Department of Education and the chief non-public-school officials prior to title I was described as good, but "there was little actual communication." Title I acted as a catalyst for improving communication. "This has been the case all over the State." Non-public-school officials contend that title I has developed more communication, "but it would be hard to improve the kind of relationship we have had."

The public sector initiated communication at the State level. As a non-public-school official commented, "because it was their program to offer." A State title I official summed up the public-nonpublic schools relationship in this way: "There is much positive evidence of increased understanding of the problems that each has, and of mutual respect as they communicate better." The State title I evaluation summarizes: "With few exceptions the State has enjoyed a good climate between public and nonpublic schools."

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The title I project provided a program for the enrichment of the educational experiences of children in grades K–3 by adding professional personnel in a team approach.

The title I program was focused on 14 schools in the district, including one Catholic elementary school.

The remaining Catholic schools were not included in the program because they were not in the target area.

The planning and administration preperation took place between June 1965 and January 15, 1966. The fiscal year 1966 project was carried out between January 17, 1966, and June 10, 1966, and the fiscal year 1967 project between September 1, 1966, and August 31, 1967.

The project took place on public school grounds, and on non-public-school grounds for nonpublic children during the regular school day.

The maximum basic grant (fiscal year 1966) for the LEA was $696,422. The primary grade enrichment program accounted for $266,323 and funds for construction of three instructional resource centers and supplementary classrooms accounted for the balance. The maximum basic grant (fiscal year 1967) was $625,098.

TABLE 40.—*LEA date, case No. M–40*

Number of children eligible	2,774
Number of public school children participating	5,023
Number of non-public-school children participating	123
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.86
Expenditure per participant	$135.27
Title expenditure rank	8(20)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	4(10)

Inservice meetings were held for public school teachers, but non-public-school teachers were not invited. The title I coordinator explained, "It just did not occur to us to invite the non-public-school teachers. Nobody thought of it." They will be involved in fiscal year 1967, "if there is a program next year." The non-public-school officials had two meetings with the title I coordinator in October 1965, which the non-public-school personnel found "very helpful in clarifying" title I. The relationship between the public and nonpublic schools was described as "excellent" by non-public-school officials. Public school officials appeared "very willing" to involve the nonpublic school in title I.

Representatives from the nonpublic schools were not involved in planning projects in fiscal year 1966, but they were "consulted." A non-public-school principal explained, "They asked for, and we gave them, extensive information about our students' needs." Non-public-school officials were involved in planning during the second year. In fiscal year 1966, one meeting was held between representatives of public and nonpublic schools to determine the non-public-school needs. Non-public-school officials were consulted in a limited way in determining the needs of the non-public-school students and the final focus of the project.

The title I coordinator admitted to "moving very slowly" in applying title I funds to children in nonpublic schools in order to avoid as many difficulties as possible. "We want to work, and we want to avoid problems rather than solving them after they have arisen."

In fiscal year 1966 the public school sector made an agreement to share one-tenth of the title I resources with the nonpublic schools because the enrollment is about one-tenth that of the public schools. The enrichment projects for grades K–3 involved specialists in almost every area. These specialists constitute the point of contact with the nonpublic schools. The public schools have added one extra teacher and one teacher aide for each three teachers already in the building.

Non-public-school principals stated that "scheduling was very cooperative." The public schools consulted with them about the best times for employing the specialists. There were scheduling problems in fiscal year 1967, but they were worked out through the joint cooperation of both sectors. The ready availability and the desirability of the program resulted in substantial participation of nonpublic schools in fiscal year 1967. In fiscal year 1966, the nonpublic schools received minimal benefits from title I, but in fiscal year 1967, title I coordinators stated that the nonpublic schools were better organized. As a result, the nonpublic schools enjoyed a considerable amount of participation and services.

Prior to title I, the climate for cooperation between public and nonpublic schools was described by both parties as excellent, "but we did not have much to do with each other." The climate has been altered only in the fact that there is more cooperation since the implementation of title I. More knowledge has been gained "about each other's programs and philosophies," and there has been "more dialog, more mutual understanding." Both public and nonpublic sectors had an excellent impression of the quality of each other's educational programs.

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in the project evaluation, "but we (title I staff) evaluated ourselves with regard to how well we thought we had served them, considering the resources we had." The non-public-school officials received copies of the evaluations. The public school principals also were not involved in the evaluation process.

Both public and nonpublic officials were in agreement that the title I project was effective in meeting the needs of the non-public-school children.

The title I coordinator would like to see the money granted directly to the nonpublic schools. "They could then develop the programs they need and want without having to funnel the effort through us."

The public school principals suggested that more specialists should be assigned to nonpublic schools either full time, or for a majority of their time. A better arrangement to suit the nonpublic school was advocated by public school officials.

CHAPTER IV

CASE STUDIES—SMALL SCHOOL SYSTEMS

The 10 case studies reported in this chapter describe ESEA title I activities which center around the involvement of non-public-school children in 10 small school systems.

These school districts enrolled less than 10,000 pupils. The geographic distribution is as follows: Three Northeastern States, three Southern States, one Central State, two North Central States, one Northwestern State. Each case describes a school system located in a different State.

Information for these 10 studies has been obtained from the same sources listed in the beginning of chapter II. The description of State and local characteristics follows the same pattern as those cases described in the two previous chapters.

CASE S-1

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This case describes a small school district located in a predominately rural Northeastern State. The State's title I allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $1,731,377.55. Approved projects accounted for 95 percent of these funds. Half of the State average current expenditure is $224.65.

TABLE 41.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-1*

Number of children eligible	7,707
Number of public school children participating	11,872
Number of non-public-school children participating	1,671
Number of nonschool participants	659
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.84
Expenditure per participant	$115.82
Title I expenditure rank	6(20)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	4(15)

The State is divided into 14 counties, 13 of which were eligible for ESEA title I funds. Sixty-three of the more than 200 school districts enroll more than 300 youngsters.

State constitutional and statutory provisions concerning the use of State funds for nonpublic schools are vague. A 1961 ruling in the case of a private citizen versus a local school district held that public funds may not be used for support of a sectarian school, even though such a school was being used by the school district to discharge its educational duties and all students of the district were required to attend.

The maximum LEA allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $26,733 and for fiscal year 1967 was $24,100. In fiscal year 1967 the State included delinquent children and neglected children and used the 1965 AFDC figures. This increased the number of eligible children in the State and funds had to be spread out more sparsely in fiscal year 1967.

TABLE 42.—*LEA data, case No. S-1*

Number of children eligible	120
Number of public school children participating	162
Number of non-public-school children participating	117
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:2.33
Expenditure per participant	$99.40
Title I expenditure rank	9(26)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	4(15)

The assistant to the superintendent is the LEA coordinator of ESEA title I. He assumed these responsibilities in September 1966. The fiscal year 1967 program was a continuation of the fiscal year 1966 approved project for remedial reading which had been designed and written by his predecessor. The superintendent volunteered the information that his former assistant had designed and planned the only funded project—that of remedial reading. The assistant explained it to the pastor, now deceased, who had been very interested in the project and indicated a desire to participate, since his parish school had been selected for title I involvement.

Subsequent interviews with the principal of that school and with the newly appointed principal of the nearby nonpublic high school revealed that they were aware of this meeting, but did not know what transpired at that time. This took place during the summer months, and the non-public-school principals were informed of the remedial reading project by the assistant to the superintendent.

The new ESEA title I coordinator said that the non-public-school administrators were very interested in participating in title I projects. Decisions concerning fiscal year 1967 had already been decided before he assumed his new responsibilities. Both sectors agree that he is working very closely with the two non-public-school principals. The nonpublic high school principal said, "Generally speaking there is a genuine willingness to involve us in title I and in a shared-time arrangement in the new vocational high school." "They know they have to consider us," was the way the nonpublic elementary school principal described the willingness of the public sector to involve non-public-school children. "They made the decision as to what to do, then let us know about it so we could go along with it. We could not institute a project even though I tried in fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967." She wanted a program to aid those children with bilingual problems. She did succeed in getting a vocabulary development program as part of the summer session for these children.

Non-public-school teachers were not included in in-service programs for teachers of title I children because all such instruction was done by public school teachers. The nonpublic sector felt the reason for their exclusion was nepotism. One non-public-school official stated, "Personnel involved in the program were all related to public school officials by marriage."

Original plans called for a central reading center. The nonpublic elementary school principal suggested that the teacher come to the respective schools rather than transport the children to one public school. As a result, all elementary school children, public and nonpublic, stayed in their own school, and the one school idea was abandoned both in fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967. This was true of the nonpublic high school participation in fiscal year 1966 only. In fiscal year 1967 the new reading teacher, wife of the superintendent, did not drive a car. The students were required to go to the public high school. Scheduling did not permit this kind of arrangement; none of the eligible nonpublic high school students participated in the fiscal year 1967 program.

In explaining this situation to the interviewer, the superintendent said the change in participation was due to the fact that funds were cut back and that there were scheduling difficulties. He declined to mention the cause for the latter. He assured the interviewer that this had been compensated for by increasing the number of nonpublic elementary school children. This was contradicted by the nonpublic elementary school principal, "The numbers were cut down this year (fiscal year 1967). Further, when children were returned to class after completion of treatment, there was no student replacement as before. The time spent by the teacher was reduced by half an hour daily." The teacher conducts remedial reading classes for eligible children in grades 3 through 8. The superintendent said that public school teachers conducted classes in the nonpublic school once a week. He appears to be misinformed.

The public sector claimed that limited available funds was a major reason for not including a greater number of eligible non-public-school children in title I projects. The nonpublic sector disagreed. They claimed that lack of qualified public school personnel was the limiting factor. When teachers and services come to the nonpublic schools, participation is maximized. Conversely, if non-public-school children must be transported elsewhere, participation is minimal.

Generally, the cooperation between the two sectors has been favorable. Some tension existed a few years ago when the pastor of the parochial school opposed and urged opposition to the construction of a new public high school. His motives were not clear. The nonpublic high school principal expressed regret that in the past nonpublic administrators wished to keep their system separate. "The climate was not very good and it wasn't the public schools' fault * * *. The nonpublic schools wished to stay by themselves. The climate has definitely changed for the better in the last 2 years; however, this was not caused by title I. New people with new ideas and a better spirit of cooperation * * * have improved the climate in the educational area. There is good rapport between the newly appointed ESEA coordinator and our schools. He had guaranteed a meeting for the purpose of jointly developing new programs."

The nonpublic schools are academicaly oriented and have turned away the vocational and less capable students. If the plan for shared time at the new vocational high school can be worked out, the nonpublic schools will be able to provide for the needs of the above-mentioned groups.

The remedial reading specialist at the elementary level remarked, "I don't know about their schools, I work with children." The non-public-school principal comments, "With regard to personnel and curriculum, the public schools are overrated. They are not as efficiently managed as they should be. The nonpublic schools, on the other hand, are underrated and suffer from an inferiority complex traditional among these schools."

Educators from both sectors agree that involvement of all eligible children from both sectors is highly desirable. "Title I permits programs and services which we could never afford. This, in turn, benefits the total community. Future leaders come from both sectors," remarked the ESSA coordinator during the interview. There is evidence to conclude that he is acting accordingly.

LEA evaluation of the fiscal year 1966 project did not involve nonpublic school personnel nor did they receive a copy of the same. Because the State guidelines failed to mention this, it appears that it simply never occurred to public school personnel to involve the nonpublic school personnel in project evaluations. The nonpublic elementary principal was not aware that evaluation was a part of title I. Had she known, she would have requested a copy. Both nonpublic school principals indicated that they would call this to the attention of the ESEA coordinator.

Records containing test scores, anecdotal reports, and progess charts of individual nonpublic school children were sent to the nonpublic schools. The ESEA coordinator mentioned the fact that the parochial school had an excellent testing program of its own.

"Title I has forced us to take a look at our curriculum, especially in English * * *. More emphasis will be placed on reading skills and on the identification and correction of reading difficulties," commented the nonpublic high school principal.

With the present quota of available funds (approximately $25,000) there is no better way to spend the money. Problems are primarily operational in nature. Lack of space, scheduling difficulties, need for transportation. Additional money would enable the LEA to hire more teachers, some of whom would help at nonpublic schools.

The nonpublic high school principal was very vocal on the subject of recommendation: "There is a need for counseling service for disturbed children, for educational and vocational guidance services * * *. Many parochial educators are indifferent to Government programs; some are unwilling to give real cooperation in making them work. They are not involved in the competition of public schools * * *. Better communications must be worked out."

As evidenced by interested citizens who were interviewed, a member of the local school board, the editor of a local newspaper, and an officer of the chamber of commerce, the favorable climate in this local community is due partially to freedom from bias and prejudice. These gentlemen believe the public and nonpublic schools have always related very favorably to one another; however, they admitted that there have been instances of misunderstanding, such as opposition of some nonpublic school personnel to the construction of the new vocational high school at the same time they were building a new school of their own. Tension was eased when the new pastor supported the public school cause. "Also the clergymen's eccumenical association has notably improved mutual understanding in the local community."

They agree in thinking that all kinds of educational facilities should be made available to all students. "I do believe in the separation of church and state, but have no objection to ESEA legislation. In fact, I would feel bad if the nonpublic schools were left out. Parents of these children pay taxes and need help just as much." They believe tax moneys set aside for the public schools should remain in the hands of the public school system but that all schools should share in its purchasing power.

CASE S-2

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case S-2 is a small school district located in a southwestern county of a northeastern State. In fiscal year 1966 the maximum State allocation was $4,014,213.35. According to the fiscal year 1966 SEA evaluation and State level interviews, approximately 94 percent of this amount was authorized and about 85 percent was expended on approved projects. Half the State average current expenditure per pupil for 1963–64 was quoted as $189.95. The State is divided into 16 counties, all of which were eligible for title I funds. The State department of education lists 412 local educational agencies functioning as independent administrative units.

TABLE 43.—*SEA basic State data, case No. S-2*

Number of children eligible	21,133
Number of public school children participating	30,374
Number of non-public-school children participating	1,887
Number of nonschool participants	57
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.53
Expenditure per participant	$105.58
Title I expenditure rank	7(22)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	6(22)

The State's constitutional provisions authorize public aid to private schools for educational purposes under certain conditions. Provisions are also made for transportation of school children to and from schools other than public schools, except such schools "as are operated for profit in whole or in part." This law may differ from one municipality to another, since the matter is discretionary with voters in each governmental unit. Majority vote controls the decision from year to year. Problems which could stem from such unstable legislation have been very few.

From September to December, 1965, the SEA title I staff held a series of regional meetings for LEA superintendents and for public school administrators. Separate meetings were held for Catholic school principals and pastors and for the State school boards association during the month of November in order to explain the implications of the act.

Since April 1966 three State title I consultants have been working full time with superintendents of schools in planning and evaluating projects. From information available, it appears that the LEA superintendents are also LEA coordinators of Government programs in this State.

In March 1966 the State department of education published a report entitled "Title I of Public Law 89–10: Program Operation." This included a summary of guidelines and instruction for title I ESEA prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, together with additional information which the State commissioner deemed necessary for clarification and for implementation at the local level. Provisions for non-public-school participation are listed: (1) The application for each project must show the degree and manner of expected participation by educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools in the project area of the LEA under title I; (2) programs shall not be designed solely for private school children; (3) funds cannot be used for inservice training of private school teachers; (4) funds cannot be used to strengthen the instructional program in a private school, and (5) each LEA must initiate comparable and equitable services for educationally deprived students who reside in the project area and attend private schools.

Since the 1963–64 State average expenditure per pupil included the number of children enrolled in nonpublic schools, the State title I director and his staff strongly recommended that all eligible children be given equal opportunities to share in the benefits. In fiscal year 1966 about 90 percent of the applications included no participation by nonpublic-school children. In one or two cases the LEA's claimed the nonpublic schools were not interested. This was the exception, not the rule. On a statewide basis, a higher rate of participation by non-public-school children is evident because of a rather unique arrangement in the northern part of this State. In that area several public schools are administered by nuns because the non-Catholic children of school age are so few in number. The Jewish schools in this State have no eligible children, and the Seventh-day Adventists do not wish to participate in this program.

The following impressions were gathered exclusively from interviews with title I personnel at the State level and with those in administrative positions in the Catholic diocesan school office, which has a statewide responsibility for administering the elementary and secondary schools under its jurisdiction.

Communications between these two sectors have been excellent for at least the past 15 years. The diocesan superintendent commented that the State superintendent had been the best help he has had over a period of 10 years. They keep each other informed about educational matters. The rapport between the two superintendents has been excellent for many years. In such a climate of mutual understanding, problems of participation and equal benefits are negligible. The chief administrators of the nonpublic schools were not as knowledgeable of the local situation as perhaps they should be. Informed by the field service coordinator of details of the local situation, they judged it to be quite typical of the State situation. In general, the local non-public-school personnel are informed of a planned and/or funded project and asked if they wish to participate. When services are rendered at the nonpublic schools, substantial participation is possible. When children have to be transported, the numbers participating are reduced.

The diocesan superintendent admitted that greater participation could be affected if the system had a title I coordinator. He indicated that such an appointment would be made in September 1967. He envisions possibilities of increased shared services and shared time activities. No legal problems have presented themselves at the State level.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The LEA selected for study is one of 13 independent LEA's in the county. For fiscal year 1966, the county identified 1,244 eligible children (5–17) and received a maximum allotment of $236,297.80.

TABLE 44.—*LEA data, case No. S–2*

Number of children eligible	400
Number of public school children participating	339
Number of nonpublic school children participating	58
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.99
Expenditure per participant	$190.91
Title I expenditure rank	2(10)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	6(22)

Fifteen public schools comprise the LEA. The State title I director authorized $60,480.46 for this district. Three nonpublic schools were included and received maximum authorization for $15,309.59, making a total of $75,790.05. In this district, 400 children were eligible for title I funds, and a quote from a State administrative newsletter explains, "In public school districts where private schools are located, the amount of funds authorized for the district because of the resident low-income family children aged 5–17 attending the private school will be listed. The public school agency is required by law to plan services for these private school pupils in the same proportion as the funds allocated because of their presence. Only the children in private schools in the public school attendance areas for which the project is planned are entitled to services under title I." Twenty-eight non-public-school children participated in programs during the academic year. An undetermined number took advantage of the very fine summer program.

In this LEA the director of elementary education was delegated by the local superintendent to handle ESEA title I activities. In fiscal year 1966, he and his staff talked about the project in the public schools and agreed on a remedial reading program. They contacted the non-public-school principals, went to their schools, discussed the project with them, and incorporated some of their ideas. In fiscal year 1967 a joint, day-long meeting of school administrators was held to discuss plans for projects for the next year. The principal of one of the junior high public schools is chairman of the Federal Relations Committee of the State Teacher's Association and was very active in lobbying for ESEA. A segment of the non-public-school sector was happy to take advantage of this invaluable assistance. The public school administrators were impressed by the enthusiastic positive response from two of the three eligible nonpublic schools. All three nonpublic schools were helpful and cooperative in providing data about children selected for participation in the funded projects. They provided complete files on these children.

Non-public-school teachers were not on project staffs and, therefore, did not participate in inservice programs. However, the reading specialists conducted workshops for the teachers of the three schools she visited every week. Praise and compliments for her professional assistance testify to her unusual ability in her field of specialization.

The principal of one of the eligible nonpublic elementary and junior high schools said, "We applied to teach in the summer program but were not accepted. The reason given was that they were not ready for this at the State level." It appears that the local public school administrators may not want them and/or may feel they are not qualified. In the northern part of the State, nuns have been accepted as staff members for summer programs.

The principal of the third nonpublic school was serving as a substitute for the principal who had become ill during the summer of 1966. It appears that the substitute principal was ill fitted for this position. She was unable to understand or answer most questions asked during the interview. Another staff member volunteered limited information. In fiscal year 1966 four children from this school were bussed to a project in a nearby public school. This was discontinued in fiscal year 1967. The non-public-school principal willingly provided background data for these four eligible children. Beyond this there was a desire to remain independent and aloof. This same principal asked the LEA if one of her staff members could teach in the project. The LEA promised "to consider it for next year." Unfortunately, this nonpublic school is one of the largest in the county. Undesirable human relations compound the void created by the lack of any kind of public relations.

Among the perceptions of the nonpublic schools as voiced by LEA officials, the following deserve mention: (1) Title I has strengthened a good climate. We better understand their problems, their aims and objectives. Watching them work under some real handicaps has increased our respect for them. (2) They have to settle for some lay teachers who fail to qualify for the public school system. (3) They have devoted teachers who do a good job on fundamentals but lack imaginative teaching techniques. They live in a world of their own and run unworldly schools. (4) Church influence is strong. Parents want the French culture to predominate and insist on a strong program of religious education. (5) Religious faculties are attending more conventions and joint meetings and we are getting to know them better. (6) Their curriculum is about the same as ours. Their classes are overcrowded and they send their problem children to us.

The public schools of the LEA as they are perceived by two nonpublic elementary school administrators: (1) Their workshops, project planning sessions, and joint meetings have helped us very much. (2) Their curriculum is good. Probably the best in the State; it is well outlined and better than ours. (3) They have better qualified personnel than we do. (4) The LEA title I coordinator is most helpful. (5) The reading specialist shows us how to use the new equipment she brings with her. Unfortunately, she is not permitted to store it in our school. With this arrangement, we can't become familiar with it.

The reading specialist came to one of the nonpublic elementary schools which also housed the junior high classes for a full-day each week during the academic year. She met her special students in a classroom that had been remodeled for that purpose. The expense for the renovation was assumed by the parish. The reason given for excluding the third eligible nonpublic school was that it was not in the project area. However, the field service coordinator senses major communications problems. The LEA coordinator lamented the dearth of qualified reading specialists during the academic year. This limitation restricted the number of children who could receive help.

A sufficient number of specialists was available for the summer session. Transportation was provided for all children. Nurses, physicians, guidance counselors, speech therapists, in addition to remedial reading teachers, were engaged. Public and non-public-school personnel counseled and encouraged parents to send their children to the summer project. Both sectors complained of parental apathy in this matter. "During the summer six teachers, a nurse, reading consultant, a director, and two assistant teachers were available for fewer than thirty students." A variety of supplementary learning materials and new equipment enhanced the summer program.

The LEA coordinator and the teachers who staffed the funded projects evaluated them. They saw no need to involve non-public-school administrators in this phase of the program. Copies of the LEA evaluation report were circulated during a joint meeting of school administrators in January 1967. "Unintentional omission" appeared to be the reason for not sending this report to non-public-school principals. The uncommunicative non-public-school principal considered it "bold to ask for the fiscal year 1966 LEA evaluation form." For this reason she did not request it.

Complete reports on each child who participated in the summer project were sent to the nonpublic schools. The director of the summer program delivered the folders and explained the results to the non-public-school administrators.

Both sectors expressed great satisfaction at the degree of improvement in reading. Test results and diagnostic information gave direction to remedial instruction programs.

A consensus favored the continuation of the reading program. Increased funds would be used to equip a materials resource center to be used by both systems.

The influential citizens—an officer of the chamber of commerce, a member of the school committee, and the secretary-treasurer of a local insurance company—knew little if anything about ESEA title I. "If I weren't on the school committee, I wouldn't know about it. The same is true of other interested citizens." They recommended that the LEA should use all means of communication to inform the public about ESEA legislation.

At both the State and local levels, barriers which could discourage and hamper full participation in title I activities are practically nonexistent. The newly appointed nonpublic coordinator of title I will need to work very closely with the eligible non-public-school personnel who staff the elementary school and who wish to remain isolated and detached from Federal moneys. Not enough is being done in the LEA title I offices to solve the bilingual problems which seem to plague eligible title I participants.

CASE S–3

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This case is a small school system, one of the four LEA's located in a county on the western borderline of a Gulf State.

The fiscal year 1966 State maximum basic grant was $30,894,243.60 for more than a quarter of a million children who qualified for aid under title I. Funds committed during fiscal year 1966 amounted to $20,882,315. The discrepancy between the basic grant and the amount committed is due chiefly to the fact that a number of local school boards voted not to apply for title I funds. Others did not choose to comply with civil rights requirements.

TABLE 45.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S–3*

Number of children eligible	254,903
Number of public school children participating	247,483
Number of non-public-school children participating	3,605
Number of nonschool participants	6,999
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.01
Expenditure per participant	$80.91
Title I expenditure rank	10 (28)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	10 (30)

Since the diocesan boundary is coterminous with the State boundary, the duties and responsibilities of the diocesan superintendent are similar to those of the State commissioner. He has not appointed a director of Government programs but does have a large staff of school supervisors who keep him informed of title I activities. "The State ESEA director oriented the nonpublic schools through regional and local meetings and through correspondence. He and his staff have been most cooperative and apparently are quite willing for the nonpublic sector to have its due. At no point, however, were non-public-school officials involved in the planning and writing of projects."

In the opinion of the diocesan superintendent, the community selected for study is typical of the kind of non-public-school involvement in ESEA title I activities in this State. "I am not very happy with this program of Federal aid under title I. It is going to put us (the diocesan school system) out of business, since the intent of the law to give comparable aid to non-public-school children is not being fulfilled. There is no possibility of this as long as we are not involved in the planning of projects at the local level."

By September 1966 a letter of civil rights compliance for all of the parochial schools in the diocese had been sent from the superintendent's office to the State department of education. In addition to this, he asked each principal to write a letter to the local superintendent stating that the Catholic school is in compliance and expressing a wish to be included in the projects being planned for eligible children. During fiscal year 1966 there were instances of nonpublic schools wishing to participate in ESEA title I, but the local school district was not in compliance or did not wish to have any part of Federal aid. For them, there was no further recourse. "ESEA title I most seriously fails to recognize the competency of the non-public-school system. The aid coming to our schools in this State has been in the form of the loans of projectors and films. During fiscal year 1966 one school had the service of a remedial reading teacher. As long as we have no voice in the planning of projects, our schools will be an afterthought, picking up what is left over."

The problem of inequitable sharing is only emphasized by the fact that about $10 million reverted to the Federal agency in fiscal year 1966. The greater part of the $20 million that was expended was used to hire additional teachers to reduce class size, for teacher aides, for furniture, equipment, and teaching materials. Almost none of this was shared with the nonpublic schools.

Some discrepancies were noted between the fiscal year 1966 SEA evaluation and statements made by the State title I director during an interview. He grossly overestimated that 94 percent of the fiscal year 1966 State funds were expended. The director claimed that the failure of local systems to comply with the civil rights provision or to request funds accounted for the residue. These residual funds were to have been portioned out to the other counties already in the program. "Some eligible LEA's have not submitted proposals because title I is generally considered a Negro activity."

According to a State official, no deliberate estrangement exists between the public and nonpublic schools. It stems from the traditional separation of church and state. He believes that title I legislation could be improved in two ways: (1) more stable funding, and (2) revised legislation which would provide aid for all eligible children regardless of the type of schools they attend. On the fiscal year 1966 SEA evaluation, this same suggestion was made together with the additional restriction that these services be rendered in the public school facilities only and on a space-available arrangement.

The diocesan superintendent believes that the only alternative would be recognition, at the Federal level, of nonpublic schools as a separate but equal educational agency.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

This county identified 8,601 eligible children and was granted $1,042,441.20 for fiscal year 1966. The LEA district under study, one of four in the county, received a maximum allotment of $352,086 in fiscal year 1966 and $224,731 in fiscal year 1967. Sixteen public schools, 11 elementary, and five junior and five senior highs, comprise this LEA. In these schools children from low-income families account for from 61 to 92 percent of the total enrollment. The principal of the only nonpublic school located in the target area conducted a survey to determine that 32 percent of the enrollment in that school came from low-income families.

The major problem in this LEA is that the need far exceeds the available ESEA funds. The LEA coordinator believes that title I activities in this district may actually be encouraging segregation since Negro parents would rather avail themselves of title I benefits in a target school than send their children to a nontarget, predominately white school.

TABLE 46.—*LEA Data, Case No. S-3*

Number of children eligible	2,905
Number of public school children participating	3,638
Number of non-public school children participating	300
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.36
Expenditure per participant	$89.41
Title I expenditure rank	10(27)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	10(30)

By telephone and correspondence, the LEA coordinator advised the non-public-school principal of available programs and indicated his willingness to help as much as possible. The non-public-school principal seemed to feel that the LEA coordinator and his staff had been cordial and cooperative at all times. There seemed to be no evidence of antagonism or bigotry. Sporadic availability of funds and hesitation on the part of non-public-school officials to challenge State constitutional provisions or to request the Attorney General's opinion are factors which restrict non-public-school children's participation in title I programs.

Ideally, title I projects should be suggested and planned by school personnel from the target schools. In practice, while suggestions may come from the public school principals and their staffs, the superintendent and the LEA coordinator decide on the final focus and plan the projects. Both sectors agree that at no time was the pastor or the principal of the nonpublic school involved in the planning of the projects.

The non-public-school principal voiced dissatisfaction when she learned that the LEA coordinator had filed her requests in a separate folder, thereby relegating them to a lower priority.

During fiscal year 1966, the LEA coordinator offered the non-public-school principal the services of teacher aides and of a nurse, audio-visual equipment, films, and free lunches. As of the date of the field survey coordinator's contact, only one aide had come to the non-public school, and that for only 4 days. The excuse given was that the aide had resigned and that others were being trained. An overhead projector and five slide projectors were made available to the nonpublic school. Each teacher was allowed a quota of three films a week. The school nurse gave the children immunization shots. The free lunch offer had to be declined. This would have necessitated busing the children to public elementary schools to eat lunch there. This cumbersome and time-consuming restriction would have placed an additional expense on the non-public school, since it is unconstitutional to provide free bus service for non-public-school children.

In fiscal year 1967 one-fourth of the maximum LEA allotment was spent on equipment and materials. Eight projects were funded, but the eligible nonpublic school children shared less. "Due to provisions of ESEA which prohibits assignment of staff and personnel to nonpublic schools on a full-time basis, no teacher aides will be assigned to nonpublic schools." Unfortunately the question of shared services on a part-time basis was never investigated by the nonpublic school. Once again the nonpublic school had to settle for less than token participation.

The 10-page fiscal year 1966 LEA evaluation of the entire title I program was very sketchy and noncommittal. The usual meaningless generalities contributed little. The nonpublic sector was completely ignored in the writing of this phase of the project. No records or data were interchanged because the eligible nonpublic school children could not afford, in terms of time and money, to be bussed to the public schools to participate in title I activities during the regular schoolday. A few nonpublic school children participated in the summer projects.

The hazy, vague, almost private interpretation of ESEA title I at the State and local levels needs to be probed and clarified, and the question of shared services be investigated.

Three interested citizens were interviewed. This group consisted of a member of the local board of education and a practicing lawyer, an M.D. who was a civil rights leader, and the assistant editor of a political party newspaper. All three confessed ignorance of the specifics of title I.

The lawyer knew of no State law forbidding the disbursal of title I funds to the nonpublic schools. He gave the interviewer the impression that he intended to look into this matter. "The community should be grateful for the presence of the parochial schools. They lessen the burden placed on the local public school system."

The physician expressed dissatisfaction with religious leaders, especially members of the clergy, because they failed "to stand up and be counted" in the civil rights movement. He believed that this fear or apathy accounted for the minimal nonpublic participation in this district.

The board member pointed out that the present legislation discriminates against the needy student attending a nonpublic school located in in a nontarget area.

Judging from the comments made by these three community leaders, a little more initiative on the part of nonpublic school leaders and increased communications between both sectors at the local level would result in a more equitable sharing of title I funds.

CASE S-4

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This small school system is located in an eastern-central State. The State's maximum allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $16,991,225.28 for ESEA title I programs. The amount for approved projects was $16,383,765.62. Half the State average expenditure per pupil for 1963-64 amounted to $159.56. The economy of this State has been affected significantly in recent years by the decline of mining and coal industries.

TABLE 47.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-4*

Number of children eligible	106, 488
Number of public school children participating	97, 787
Number of non-public-school children participating	1, 319
Number of nonschool participants	4, 487
Eligible: Participant ratio	1: 0. 97
Expenditure per participant	$141. 54
Title I expenditure rank	2 (13)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	8 (26)

The State evaluation for fiscal year 1966 includes the following meaningful comments: "During title I operation in 1966, participation of non-public-school children was limited. This was especially true for academic year programs. Summer school programs operating in June, July, and August showed much greater participation of children from nonpublic schools."

A principal limitation during early operation was found in the difficulty of establishing open communication between representatives of public schools and nonpublic schools. Such communication had not existed over past years. A special effort has been made in this State to improve communication at the local level between public school and private school representatives. Title I program specialists are visiting nonpublic schools to talk with principals and teachers on program activity and services available under title I, and to explore ways and means of making these programs available to non-public-school children.

Teachers employed by public school boards of education are assigned to remedial programs in private schools. Non-public-school children are participating in title I activity in the public school on a shared-time basis as well as in activity conducted outside the normal school day, i.e., before school, after school, and on Saturday. Further, non-public-school teachers are participating in in-service training programs provided by title I funds. When the SEA official was asked to describe any suggestions or recommendations for revising the legislation he declared: "Federal legislation seems to be adequate."

This State has county school districts. County allocations were determined by the U.S. Office of Education. No suballocations were involved since there are no subdistricts. A public school official at the State level said that title I expenditure for fiscal year 1966 was 83.6 percent of the maximum basic grant to the State. This same official also indicated that non-public-school officials did not participate in the review and approval of title I projects on the State level, but they generally participated on the local level, including the endorsement of proposed programs.

When title I project applications did not provide for participation of non-public-school children, some of the reasons offered were—

(1) No financially and educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools;

(2) Difficulties involved in participating on a shared-time basis because of the demands of the non-public-school program; and

(3) Too few eligible pupils to justify the establishment of a title I program activity in a nonpublic school.

It was the perception of a public school State official that, prior to title I, there was little or no communication between the public and private sectors. Certainly there was no working relationship. Since title I, however, communication has been established between the two separate school systems, and public and nonpublic school representatives are working together to plan and develop programs for disadvantaged children. In his opinion communication was initiated by public school representatives.

A non-public-school official at the dioceson level has made the following observations: "Orientation for title I at the State level was in most instances satisfactory; at the local levels, it left much to be desired. Representatives from the nonpublic sector were involved in planning projects only to a very limited and unsatisfactory degree.

The needs of the non-public-school students are not necessarily the needs of the public school students. With very rare exceptions, the needs of the public school students have been assessed, found, and pinpointed; and then remedies for these needs have been made available to both public and nonpublic students whether or not, in the case of the latter group, their needs were the same. Involvement in title I has caused a change in adminstrative relationships on the State level from very apathetic or detached to involved and cooperative. Communications appear to have improved progressively, but contrary to the opinion of public school officials at the State level, non-public-school officials believe this is due to the initiative of the non-public-school personnel."

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

Public school officials at the local level made the following observations:

1. Non-public-school personnel participated in all in-service meetings in the county and in regional meetings pertaining to title I.
2. Non-public-school officials seem highly interested in their involvement in title I projects and were extremely cooperative.
3. All preliminary plans were cooperatively discussed and opinions consulted.
4. Non-public-school officials were consulted concerning the needs of non-public-school children and their needs were determined to be the same as public school children's.
5. All programs were conducted within geographical proximity to the parochial school.
6. Summer programs had excellent participation by children from both private and public schools. Percentagewise, there was better participation from non-public-school students than from the public school students.
7. Communication between officials of both sectors takes place as needed and is highly desirable.
8. Non-public-school officials received the evaluation reports of non-public-school children who participated in title I programs.

A non-public-school official at the local level made statements which agree in substance with the perceptions of the public school officials.

TABLE 48.—*LEA data, case No. S-4*

Number of children eligible	879
Number of public school children participating	1,082
Number of nonpublic school children participating	50
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.29
Expenditure per participant	$122.46
Title I expenditure rank	8(24)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	8(26)

The perceptions of the field survey coordinator included the following: There were no nonprofessional persons involved in either planning or evaluationing of title I projects; and, thus, no interviews were conducted with interested citizens. There is only one nonpublic school in this county and its students were involved in title I projects. There is evidence that a genuine respect for personnel from both public and non-public school systems was present. School principals appeared to have only a very general knowledge of the intent and purpose of title I. There also seemed to be an agreement of sorts which implied that the needs of the nonpublic and the public school children were the same. It is the opinion of the field survey coordinator that the county school system was attempting to follow the intent and purposes of title I.

It was a recommendation from the nonpublic sector that the State superintendent and/or county school board deal directly with the diocesan superintendent who, in the case of the Catholic schools in this State, occupies a position equal to the chief State education officer. A public school official recommended that teacher aides be made available to private schools. Further, non-public-school personnel recommended that there be more articulation between all community agencies which are concerned with the welfare of the children. Finally, a nonpublic representative called for more parent involvement in title I activities.

CASE S-5

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

In this midwest State the maximum amount authorized was $24,509,211.50, based on a per-pupil figure of $275.75.

TABLE 49.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-5*

Number of children eligible	88, 882
Number of public school children participating	117, 672
Number of nonpublic school children participating	14, 724
Number of nonschool participants	725
Eligible: Participant ratio	1: 1. 50
Expenditure per participant	$117. 83
Title I expenditure rank	5(19)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	1(3)

The LEA's were allocated a stated amount for each eligible child in the district as determined by the USOE criteria. The SEA started planning in terms of $265.10 per pupil; the amount finally allocated was $184.70. About 64 percent of the maximum basic grant was expended by the SEA during fiscal year 1966.

There were no major constitutional problems pertaining to title I. The only restriction is that public personnel going into nonpublic schools under title I must be supervised by public personnel.

Also, the State has a quasi-arrangement for some title I programs. The public school districts may get some money from the State to help with these programs, money to add to title I money. This money is available for the programs that are in public schools. It is even available to help bus pupils to public schools from nonpublic schools. It is not available when the services are provided on the premises of the nonpublic schools. It is legal to send people to nonpublic schools to provide "remedial" and "therapeutic" services.

The Attorney General has not given the SEA any formal rulings. "He sat down and advised us informally." His position was not to raise the constitutional issues publicly. Thus far he has avoided any rulings regarding title I. The Attorney General informed the title I staff to "quietly go ahead on the assumption that the State constitution would not prevent channeling Federal moneys to benefit children."

The SEA procedure for approving title I applications was explained thus: The area directors for title I recommend approval of the application; then the assistant to the title I coordinator approves it. The Commissioner of Education serves as a court of last resort for the LEA's who disagree with the title I coordinator's assessment.

Nonpublic-school officials were not involved in the review or endorsement of applications on the State level. The title I coordinator is opposed to their involvement because "they (nonpublic officials) have too much of a vested interest in getting proposals approved. The parochial school people have ample opportunity to get into the act at the local level." The procedure for nonpublic participation in planning at the local level was explained thus: The parochial school people suggest the kinds of programs they think they need. Then the public school superintendent tries to work these ideas into the program. The title I coordinator felt that, "the public school superintendents have got the message that they must work with the nonpublic schools." The official policy emanating from the SEA is that parochial schools in disadvantaged areas (target areas) should receive a share of the services proportionate to their ratio of enrollment.

Essentially, the SEA relies on the nonpublic-school leaders themselves to insure that the arrangements are equitable. As a member of the title I staff commented, "We (title I staff) are sure that the diocesan superintendent will scream if his schools are not adequately taken care of." In describing nonpublic participation in planning title I programs, the archdiocesan superintendent for Catholic schools explained that the procedure followed was for public officials to plan the programs, and then inform the leaders in nonpublic schools of what they have planned, inviting comment. The general pattern in this area has been to consult leaders in nonpublic schools very little, if at all, while designing the programs.

In the fall of 1965 the first area meeting of the SEA was held to explain title I, and many representatives of nonpublic schools attended. Several other meetings on a regional basis were held. The SEA sends memos, directives, and guidelines to nonpublic-school officials on a regular basis.

The relationship between the SEA and chief non-public-school officials prior to title I was described by the title I staff as being a situation in which "they ignored us and we ignored them." After title I, there was a realization "that relationships between the State department and different kinds of schools cannot be avoided." In general the State officials described the current relationship as "fairly cordial." The archdiocesan superintendent stated that prior to title I State officials were very rigid about working with nonpublic schools in any way, interpreting constitutional provisions "superciliously." Since the advent of title I projects, nonpublic officials feel that cooperation has been much improved. Both the public and nonpublic officials are concerned about legal action relative to title I. The archdiocesan superintendent stated that there has been a marked tendency for public State and local officials to use confusion over title I as an excuse for halfhearted action. "They are afraid some citizen will take them to court and will have them held personally responsible for illegal disbursement of funds." In contrast the State coordinator presented an opinion that the nonpublic personnel "are reluctant to complain. They are afraid to rock the boat, fearing that if someone makes an issue of the arrangement under title I, the whole affair will be held unconstitutional, and they will be out altogether."

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The title I project provided comprehensive reading skills for the school year and a summer enrichment program with available psychological and social services. The fiscal year 1967 title I project was a continuation of the fiscal year 1966 project.

TABLE 50.—*LEA data, case No. S–5*

Number of children eligible	187
Number of public school children participating	264
Number of non-public-school children participating	55
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.71
Expenditure per participants	$161.65
Title I expenditure rank	4 (14)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	1 (3)

The title I program was focused on nine schools in the district, including one Catholic elementary school.

School	Total enrollment [1]	Percent economically deprived	Number of economically deprived	Number of educationally deprived [1]
1. Elementary	------------	7.2	8	------------
2. Elementary	------------	6.0	10	------------
3. Elementary	------------	5.7	9	------------
4. Elementary	------------	5.1	20	------------
5. Elementary	------------	4.7	30	------------
6. Elementary (Catholic)	------------	4.0	38	------------
7. Elementary	------------	3.8	21	------------
8. Junior high	------------	3.3	28	------------
9. High school	------------	1.4	23	------------

[1] Not available.

Note: Total public, 257; total nonpublic, 55.

The remaining Catholic school was not included in the program because it was not in the area of highest concentration.

The most pressing educational need of educationally deprived children in these attendance areas was identified as reading. The criteria for judging the needs on both elementary and secondary levels included intelligence and reading tests and teacher observation.

The planning and administrative preparation took place between June 1, 1965, and January 1966. The fiscal year 1966 project took place from January 17, 1966, to June 1, 1966, and the fiscal year 1967 project from August 29, 1966, to August 31, 1967.

The maximum basic grant (fiscal year 1966) for the LEA for $51,565.25. The maximium basic grant (fiscal year 1967) was $37,400, and $36,400 was the amount approved for the project.

The project took place in public and non-public-school facilities, during the regular schoolday. The summer program was held in public facilities during the day.

The title I coordinator explained that the nonpublic personnel were "intimately involved in every detail of the planning * * * even long before any documents were put together." At least five meetings with the nonpublic officials were held before any program decisions were made. Both the public school principals involved in the title I program and the title I coordinator stated that the nonpublic principal "was involved in the planning all along," but the nonpublic principal asserted that there was no nonpublic participation at all. "We were asked for reactions far too late to permit real participation." There are two contradictory opinions evident, relative to the orientation and planning for title I in this LEA.

The public school officials identified the needs that they felt were general throughout the district, and then asked for non-public-school officials' reactions. They agreed to the same needs and suggested no changes. In preparing the application the public-school officials claim to have asked about eligible nonpublic children, but a nonpublic principal denied emphatically that this information was requested. In essence, the nonpublic officials were not contacted until the proposal was ready for State approval.

Non-public-school officials were not invited to participate in the planning of the summer program. After the program was structured, they were invited to participate. The nonpublic sector was not consulted in determining the needs or the final focus of the summer program.

Inservice programs were established for title I remedial teachers, but nonpublic teachers did not participate. The non-public-school principal involved was not aware of the inservice training being conducted.

Scheduling, both in time and location, proved to be no problem. The remedial program was located on non-public-school premises, with the schedule controlled by the nonpublic principal. A full-time remedial reading teacher was assigned and the nonpublic principal could "use her pretty well as I wish to do." She is free to decide most of the details of the operation, though the program is formally under the supervision of a public school principal. In the summer program, the non-public-school students were bussed on the same basis as public school students; the project was located in two centrally located public schools. The nonpublic schools referred a disproportionate number of youngsters to the summer school program. They took greater advantage of the opportunity than did the public schools.

The remedial reading instructor is the only individual assigned to the nonpublic schools. A psychologist and social worker were available during the summer.

The lack of qualified personnel from the local public-school system proved to be a significant problem in inhibiting full participation of nonpublic students in title I. Since the public-school officials could not locate a qualified psychologist and social worker, the participation of pupils in these services was cut off altogether.

The climate of cooperation between public and nonpublic officials has been described as "tremendous" by the title I coordinator, although there have been some difficulties with a priest of one of the parishes. A nonpublic official asserted that "they (public-school officials) work with us only because they have to—because there are many Catholics in the area, or because title I requires it."

Since title I, there has been much more contact. Joint meetings of public and nonpublic principals are held. There have been no changes in basic attitudes; it is maintained that they have always been good. Contact is more extensive and frequent. The nonpublic officials find communication very frequent and useful.

There are no local pressure groups opposed to title I, but nonpublic officials stated that the superintendent warned of what pressure groups might do if he were too liberal with nonpublic schools. The nonpublic officials were urged not to make an issue out of what they are denied under title I, because pressure groups will become active, and the nonpublic sector, "will end up with less than they would have got if they had kept quiet." Also, other than title I, there are no shared-time arrangements. The superintendent is, in principle, against shared-time activities not completely supported by title I funds. Otherwise, it would cause a loss of State aid for part-time pupils. Nonpublic school officials point out that just a few miles outside of the district shared-time programs are common.

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in any phase of project evaluations. The public school personnel evaluated in terms of straight testing. The non-public-school personnel were informed of the results and received a copy of the evaluation after it went to the State.

It was a consensus of both public and non-public-school officials that the title I project was effective in meeting the needs of both public and nonpublic school children. All considered the remedial reading project as a primary necessity, but non-public-school officials suggested that remedial mathematics, remedial speech, and inservice training for teachers would be helpful.

Non-public-school officials, although satisfied with the remedial reading program, expressed reservations relative to the "assumption that public school officials know what we need much more than we do, and the assumption that we should be thankful for any help they feel fit to give us." Criticism was directed toward the public school personnel because "no aspect of the project was planned with any nonpublic pupils in mind, or even with suggestions or information from us concerning the needs of our school." In summary, a nonpublic official commented, "Fortunately, we happened to need a remedial reading teacher."

CASE S-6

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case S-6 is based on a small school system of a northern Midwest State. The maximum amount authorized to this State under title I in fiscal year 1966 was $18,030,939.15. Seventy-two percent of the maximum basic grant was expended in fiscal year 1966. In fiscal year 1967 the SEA expects that 98 percent of the total grant will be expended.

TABLE 51.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-6*

Number of children eligible	68,781
Number of public school children participating	61,552
Number of nonpublic school children participating	12,923
Number of nonschool participants	56
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.08
Expenditure per participant	$174.19
Title I expenditure rank	1(17)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	2(6)

In fiscal year 1966 the SEA received $262.15 per child (one-half the State average current expenditure 1963–64) for low-income and AFDC children, but the money was allocated to the LEA's on the basis of low-income children only. In fiscal year 1967 the SEA was ordered to allocate on the basis of both low-income and AFDC children, but the SEA made some adjustments so that some districts would not incur too large a cut in funds in 1 year.

During fiscal year 1966, when nonpublic children were not included in the applications, the SEA simply accepted the word of the local public school official that the nonpublic schools did not wish to participate. The title I staff "soon learned that approach was not adequate." In too many cases the public school personnel had established programs unilaterally and had invited nonpublic schools to participate only after "everything was cut and dried." At present the SEA title I staff is not accepting the statement that nonpublic schools do not want to participate without a written statement from the nonpublic schools. The title I director commented, "Even this does not seem to be adequate." The title I staff is planning to insist that the nonpublic schools be invited into the planning of title I projects. The director found that "the most successful programs, as far as non-public-school participation is concerned, are those which the public and nonpublic schools planned jointly. We have been passing the word around the State that we will insist on this." Also, the title I staff insists "that pupils from present LEA's include non-public-school students on a proportionate basis to public school students in the title I prgram. We (title I staff) are not going to permit this anymore." Every child will have to qualify on the basis of economic deprivation, "even if the approach cuts down on the proportion coming from nonpublic schools."

According to the Attorney General's ruling of July 1966 requested by the SEA, the State constitution prohibits the use of title I funds by nonpublic school children except on the premises of the public schools. No programs may be on the premises of nonpublic schools, and title I funds may not be used to bus pupils from nonpublic schools to the location of title I programs. The SEA approach has been to encourage the LEA's "to provide the services in public schools that are close to the nonpublic schools."

In general, no public school personnel have been permitted to provide services on the premises of nonpublic schools. In a very few cases, where the public school has been short of space, and the nonpublic school has been close by, the public school has rented a room in the nonpublic school and established the title I program. To do this is not to provide the services on the premises of nonpublic schools; such rented rooms are public school premises.

Professional educators on the staff of the SEA title I director review the LEA applications and they are finally approved by the title I director. Non-public-school officials were not invited by SEA personnel to review or endorse applications prior to final approval. The title I director felt that "the nonpublic schools are sufficiently represented on the title I advisory committee."

The title I director described the relationship between the SEA and the chief non-public-school officials as "good all along," but the Catholic diocesan superintendent explained that "relationships have been strained for a period of about 20 years. During the last 6 months, things have improved a little, but one cannot be sure title I is the important factor in this improvement." The title I director asserted that "Title I has not changed attitudes. It has merely provided a test of how genuine our attitude of good will was, forcing us to see whether we could get down to working things out at the operational level." He felt relationships are improving as time passes.

SEA personnel took the initiative in sending non-public-school officials title I information, but they were not formally invited to participate in any regional conferences. Non-public-school officials attended some regional and LEA meetings. These sessions were generally informative and discussion was devoted to what was and was not possible under title I in the light of the State constitution. The diocesan superintendent stated, "as it turned out, not much was possible." The SEA insisted that no programs could be provided on the premises of nonpublic schools, no equipment could be provided to nonpublic schools, and title I funds could not be used to bus nonpublic students to title I activities on public school premises.

Non-public-school personnel are not on the SEA mailing list for title I materials. The title I staff "assumes that the local title I coordinator will disseminate the proper information to nonpublic schools."

The diocesan superintendent explained that nonpublic officials "have had to go after them (title I personnel) many times to try to obtain information. We are kept constantly guessing as to what they have done, what they are doing, and what they plan to do." A consultant for the archdiocese described the nonpublic (Catholic) relationship with the SEA as "rather poor for a number of years." Relationships are better at the local level, though the consultant estimated that the Catholic schoolchildren received at least 30 percent below what they were entitled to receive under title I at the local level. In his opinion "most of the problems lie at the "State level." The rigid approach of the SEA is an indication of timidity rather than antagonism toward Catholic schools. Public administrators "constantly express the fear that they will be held personally liable for something."

Factors inhibiting non-public-school children's participation in title I, as explained by the diocesan superintendent were—

(*a*) The inconvenience, loss of time and safety hazard for nonpublic children traveling to public schools;

(*b*) Some Catholic parents who have chosen a Catholic school for their children hesitate to allow them to attend the public school part time; and

(*c*) Non-public-school schedules must fit public school schedules, an arrangement which leads to serious difficulties.

The diocesan superintendent recommended that some title I programs should be held on the premises of nonpublic schools in order to better meet the needs of nonpublic school children. A major problem in carrying out the intent of title I in terms of involvement of nonpublic children was "closed doors in public school administration." There is little genuine communication and the diocesan superintendent desired a free discussion of these problems. The nonpublic sector expressed a need for equal representation in the planning phase of title I projects.

No public schools refused to participate in title I because of the provisions for nonpublic schools; but many Lutheran schools in the

State have refused, as a matter of principle, to participate in title I projects.

The field survey coordinator reported that he was unable, in spite of repeated questions, to draw out a description of a clear-cut mechanism for checking on the inadequacy of non-public-school children's participation. "My impression is that many cases of inequity could go unnoticed unless someone at the local level happened to complain loudly."

Questioning of the SEA title I director revealed that there was only one representative of the nonpublic schools on the advisory committee of approximately 22, and that he had not been appointed until very recently.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The major need of children within this school district was remedial and/or corrective reading programs. The title I project was designed specifically to assist students in the areas of (1) educational adjustment, (2) educational and prevocational decisionmaking, (3) cultural experiences, and (4) personal worth. The two main programs initiated were (a) in-service training for teachers of the disadvantaged, and (b) corrective reading and remedial instruction for educationally disadvantaged pupils.

There are 23 public schools in the school district, including 16 elementary public schools. The fiscal year 1967 title I program was a continuation of the fiscal year 1966 with little or no change.

TABLE 32.—*LEA data, case No. 8–6*

Number of children eligible	537
Number of public school children participating	390
Number of non-public-school children participating	55
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.83
Expenditure per participant	$316.54
Title I expenditure rank	1(3)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	2(6)

Planning for the fiscal year 1966 project took place from November 1965 to February 1966. The fiscal year 1966 project took place from April 1, 1966, to August 31, 1966. The fiscal year 1967 project took place between September 1966 and August 31, 1967.

The maximum basic grant (fiscal year 1966) for the LEA was $140,860.89; for fiscal year 1967 it was $98,131.

The program was carried out during the regular schoolday and in the summer, on public school grounds.

There was no orientation to the title I program for non-public-school personnel. The nonpublic officials were informed about the remedial reading program for the summer of 1966 by letter, and an exploratory meeting was held by the LEA. Before non-public-school personnel were invited to send non-public-school children to the summer program, the officials of nonpublic schools had heard nothing about title I.

Children in the Lutheran school system did not participate in title I projects, and Catholic school personnel were invited to send only a limited number of fourth and fifth grade students to the remedial program, although the program covers all of the elementary grades.

The school district has been reluctant to accept pupils from non-public schools who reside outside the school district; these non-public-school students need title I assistance more than any. Non-public-school officials have not been contacted by the school district in which these children reside concerning programs for these children during the school year. In general the public school officials "have been very willing to include non-public-school children" and "have expressed disappointment that more non-public-school pupils do not participate" in the title I program.

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in any phase of the planning for title I. The title I coordinator (who is the superintendent of public schools and coordinator of Federal programs) explained, "We would never have gotten this proposal written if we had asked all kinds of people to give us their ideas." He described the school district and his administration as a "benevolent autocracy." The needs of the non-public-school children were not determined by the public school officials: "We assumed that our needs would be their needs," and non-public-school personnel were excluded from any determination of the kind or focus of the projects. Non-public-school personnel were not included in the inservice program because "they are not staff members under title I." The non-public-school teachers were well aware of the summer project and received a file of information on the performance of each non-public-school student.

Within the limitations of the State guidelines, project activities were scheduled at times and in places convenient for non-public-school children's participation. However, the non-public-school officials have nothing to say about the schedule. They received a completed schedule, and have to comply with the schedule as it exists.

No title I activities were carried out on the premises of nonpublic schools; some psychological testing for the screening process was made available to non-public-school students.

The minimal participation of nonpublic schools in title I is related to—

(*a*) Safety, time, and exposure to inclement weather in traveling to the public schools;

(*b*) The complete lack of control over the title I activities, with consequent conflicts;

(*c*) Do most needy non-public-school pupils live in another school district and "consequently are not eligible for services" in this district—these pupils are not offered title I services in their own school district;

(*d*) Participation was offered to non-public-school students in the fourth and fifth grades only; and

(*e*) Parents of parochial school children are reluctant to send their children to public schools part time.

The superintendent explained that the relationships between the public and nonpublic schools "have always been wholesome. Now there are more active efforts to cooperate, but the underlying attitudes are about the same." The public schools are in "rather regular contact" with the nonpublic schools. There appears to be more cooperation and communication on the level of the principal rather than on a higher administrative level, but even this is infrequent. On the principal level the initiators of contact appear to be the public school principals, rather than the non-public-school officials.

The non-public-school principals criticized the lack of communication with title I administrators. They received no reports concerning the title I activities until the program had terminated. Also, public school officials did not contact non-public-school teachers for information on the pupils in the program. The non-public-school principals "submitted forms for the pupils we wanted to be in the program, but we never received any word concerning the decisions."

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in any phase of the project evaluation, nor did they review the project evaluation reports.

The major problems emphasized by non-public-school officials were—

(*a*) No opportunity to participate in the planning of title I activities;

(*b*) The lack of participation in formulating a schedule;

(*c*) The limited participation offered to the non-public-school children;

(*d*) The lack of communication about non-public-school pupils in the program, and the consequent lack of coordination with the regular classroom work.

The recommendations to solve these problems were—

(*a*) Participation in title I planning;

(*b*) Participation in title I scheduling;

(*c*) Participation of all children regardless of where they happen to live;

(*d*) Close contact concerning the progress of non-public-school pupils while they are in the program, and coordination of the program with the regular classroom activities; and

(*e*) Enlargement of the scope of the program in order to permit participation of all needy children.

The Lutheran schools did not participate in title I because the Lutheran board decided, strictly on its own, not to participate for 1966–67. Some factors involved in the decision were: (*a*) The Lutheran schools have few students, if any, who can be classified as culturally deprived, and (*b*) the school board is wary of the tendency toward "Big Brotherism" on the part of the Federal Government.

A public school principal in whose school a title I project operates professed ignorance on questions involving planning and orientation, confirming the superintendent's observation that the control office was a "benevolent autocracy."

The public school principals were excluded from the evaluation process. The superintendent explained his belief that it is foolish to try to be "democratic in administration."

Most pupils in the Catholic schools in this area went to kindergarten in the public schools. Now that the Catholic schools have dropped the first and second grades, the students will have even more exposure to public schools. Relationships may improve as a result.

It seems obvious that Catholic educators have been ill informed concerning the provisions of title I, and have been disunified in their approach to public school authorities.

CASE S-7

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

Case S-7 pertains to a small school system located in a county near the capital of this central southern State. The eastern part of the State has a large Indian population while the southwestern section annually attracts migrant laborers and their families from two neighboring States. Many are from Spanish-speaking families, and the schooling of these children is constantly interrupted by migration. The State received a maximum allotment of $17,375,921.34 for fiscal year 1966, based on one-half the State average expenditure per pupil of $181.29.

TABLE 53.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-7*

Number of children eligible	95,846
Number of public school children participating	182,229
Number of nonpublic school children participating	2,886
Number of nonschool participants	4,032
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.97
Expenditure per participant	$89.88
Title I expenditure rank	8 (26)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	7 (23)

An annotation appended to the State constitutional provisions concerning public aid to nonpublic schools defines the phrase "sectarian institutions" to mean parochial schools. Monetary aid to these schools and the use of public funds for the transportation of children attending parochial schools are unconstitutional. Subsequent appeals of this ruling have been dismissed and rehearings have been denied.

Shortly after Public Law 89-10 was enacted, the State attorney general ruled that dual enrollment was the only means by which the nonpublic school children could participate in title I activities.

There are more than a thousand local school districts in the 77 counties of this State. Some 796 of these had at least one title I funded project during fiscal year 1966. A few local school districts did not wish to participate in any Federal aid programs for education. A few others were eligible but declined to participate because the amount of money authorized was too modest. The remaining districts were not eligible.

Nine area assistant title I directors served as consultants in the counties assigned to them by the State title I director. These assistants also served as liaison people between the LEA and the State offices.

Prior to title I involvement, the principal relationship between the State department and non-public-school officials concerned accreditation. More frequent communication has resulted since title I involvement. "We were invited to attend one meeting sponsored by the USOE in our State. Other than this, we had to go to the State Department for all information which we wanted or needed," explained the nonpublic regional director of Government programs.

In this State the diocesan boundary is coterminous with that of the State. In August 1966, a meeting was held to discuss the participation of public and non-public-school pupils in programs developed under title I. This meeting was requested by the diocesan superintendent to determine whether or not ways and means could be found to provide equal and fair treatment for non-public-school pupils in view of the

Attorney General's ruling. Present at this meeting were two ESEA title I representatives from the U.S. Office of Education, two representatives from the State department of education, two assistants to the Attorney General, representatives from the larger public school districts, the legal adviser for the diocesan schools, the diocesan superintendent, and the diocesan director of Government programs. The public school representatives seemed most cooperative and willing to make provisions for as many non-public-school children as their school buildings and programs could accommodate. There was no attempt made by the representatives from the State department of education or from the USOE to develop ways other than dual enrollment without providing for free transportation. At the present time in this State it seems apparent that non-public-school children who are eligible to participate in title I programs will not receive fair and equal treatment.

The following excerpts are taken from various bulletins and newsletters sent from the diocesan school offices to non-public-school administrators. "In order for them (public school administrators) to carry out their obligation, it will be necessary for you (non-public-school administrators) to cooperate with them in every way you can. Do not hesitate to make the first contact. We sincerely hope that the public school authorities will ask your advice about the types of projects which will benefit your educationally disadvantaged children."

Dual enrollment without provisions for free transportation was not feasible for most children who were eligible for title I assistance and who were enrolled in nonpublic schools, for the following reasons: (1) The additional expense for transportation would most likely equal the cost of providing the services they should be receiving without cost through title I; (2) in many instances the geographic location of the public and nonpublic schools is such that the time spent in travel to participate in a remedial reading program, for example, is as great as the time spent in the class; (3) the problem of coordinating class schedules placed on the administration of both systems is very difficult; (4) nonpublic attendance areas overlap the public school districts. This creates another enormous problem since the benefits are provided to the child in the project area of the local school district in which he lives, not where he attends school, and (5) it does not seem to be sound educationally to shift children who lack social development. Adjusting to another situation could be harmful.

A large portion of title I funds in this State was used to hire additional classroom teachers in order to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio in target area schools, to train and hire teacher aides, school specialists, and clerical assistants, to purchase equipment and resource material, and to equip resource centers. Almost none of this expenditure benefited eligible non-public-school children.

Some of the larger LEA's sponsored inservice programs for teachers of educationally deprived children. Non-public-school personnel who were teaching in similar situations were invited to attend general sessions but not workshop sessions. Public school teachers received a stipend for attending; non-public-school teachers received nothing.

Non-public-school participation hinged on the various interpretations of "dual enrollment" which ranged from ultraconservative to daringly liberal. In both fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967 participation of eligible nonpublic school children in title I projects has been limited to summer programs. During fiscal year 1966 speech therapists were sent into a few of the nonpublic schools 1 day a week. In most instances this service was discontinued in fiscal year 1967. The reason given was: "These specialists were needed full time in the public schools."

At present there is no title I litigation. For almost 2 years the nonpublic school children who were entitled to receive ESEA title I assistance have received next to nothing of the 2-year total $30 million authorized for the State. The consistent and conscientious efforts of administrative personnel in the diocesan department of education have borne little fruit. In the meantime the gap between the two systems broadens and deepens. More forceful and drastic measures are being considered by the diocesan officials to insure equitable sharing of title I funds.

I. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

In fiscal year 1966, 644 children were identified as eligible for title I funds which amounted to $116,750.76 for the county in which this LEA is located. This LEA is one of the larger school districts in the county. In fiscal year 1966, $49,311.25 was allocated to the district which administers 14 public schools. Six of these schools were identified as target areas with the greatest concentration of educationally deprived children. Basic data at the local level are summarized in table 54.

TABLE 54.—*LEA data, case No. S-7*

Number of children eligible	272
Number of public school children participating	295
Number of nonpublic school children participating	0
Number of nonschool participants	100
Eligible: Participant ratio	$167.00
Expenditure per participant	1:1.47
Title I expenditure rank	3 (13)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	7 (23)

In this local school district the superintendent of schools assumed the additional responsibility of administering and coordinating Federal Government programs. He informed non-public-school personnel about the title I projects which were available. No orientation was provided for non-public-school personnel. They were not involved in planning any of the projects because: "We planned to meet the needs of the public school children and assumed that the needs of the non-public-school children were the same." Subsequently one nonpublic school became involved in title I activities. The non-public-school principal requested help in the area of remedial reading. The matter was given no further attention because the focus of approved projects in which non-public-school children could participate was the summer program. This project was designed for kindergarten-age children who would be entering first grade the following September.

There is disagreement and/or misunderstanding with respect to the attendance of non-public-school teachers at inservice programs. The non-public-school teachers said they were not included. One public school principal of a building in the target area agreed with the superintendent who said: "Non-public-school teachers may attend any inservice programs offered." A statement taken from the fiscal year 1967 application mentioned that the principal of the parochial school indicated that her teachers would participate in an inservice program developed by the art coordinator. She felt this would be the only possible involvement of her school. This, of course, would allow the students to benefit indirectly through an improved elementary school art program.

In summary, there was no orientation, no involvement in planning projects, and very little productive communication. While intercommuncation between the two sectors is highly satisfactory, the major barrier is encountered in the LEA office.

Insistence on dual enrollment without transportation dealt the deathblow to nonpublic participation. "No help was given in the area of remedial reading. We were told that no visiting remedial reading teacher was available because of lack of funds and personnel," commented a non-public-school principal of the eligible school.

The LEA superintendent agreed to the idea that involvement of non-public-school children in title I serves the educational needs of the community, but "I object to the principle of using public funds for non-public schools."

"Non-public-school officials understand the public educational system better than the public school officials understand the non-public-school system," was the way one non-public-school official appraised the degree of mutual respect for one another's system. "Their nonpublic schools) program is inadequate because of inability to provide proper staff due to lack of funds," commented an LEA official. Another public school principal regretted that there was not enough cooperation between the schools of both systems.

In place of an LEA evaluation report for fiscal year 1966, periodic progress reports containing sketchy bits of information were given to the field survey coordinator. This appears to have been the extent of evaluation of fiscal year 1966 projects in this LEA. A completely subjective narrative discussing the benefits of the summer session kindergarten program was written by one of the teachers of the staff. There was no formal or official evaluation of title I projects by non-public-school personnel. The LEA superintendent explains: "Public funds should be spent for public purposes, and non-public-school personnel should not give official evaluation. I'm sorry. I don't dislike them, but that's just the way I feel about it. Church and state should be separated. Yes, I still believe that and nothing will change my mind." He claimed that non-public-school personnel could see the evaluations if they wished; however, they would not receive copies of the report.

No data concerning eligible children enrolled in nonpublic schools were ever requested from non-public-school principals. They (non-public-school principals) did not receive any data from the LEA. No testing programs were undertaken by public school personnel in the nonpublic schools.

In the opinion of a public school administrator, the enrollment in the nonpublic school is so small it hardly justifies a separate school system. He recommended the "consolidation" of nonpublic schools with public schools. As a side remark, he added: "I wish we could get their (nonpublic schools) buildings."

Non-public-school officials urged that: (1) Federal moneys be kept from State control, (2) provisions be made by Congress for a "bypass" law similar to the one provided in titles II and III, and (3) several amendments in the State constitution should be repealed.

Comments from three interested citizens (an administrator of community action programs, a member of the local school board, and an attorney) contribute additional insight into this local community. "There is excellent cooperation between the junior high and the nonpublic school which is eligible for title I." The two citizens involved in educational programs expressed satisfaction with the title I program. On the other hand, the lawyer appeared to be scarcely aware that it was underway: "Little, if anything, is said about it (title I), and I am sure many in the community do not know that it exists." He "assumed" the title I program was equally effective for both sectors.

"I really don't know much about the Catholic school. I just know where it is located, but I have never been too concerned about it. Public school officials are somewhat suspicous of nonpublic schools. I can't say how non-public-schools people view public schools." One of the three citizens added: "Nonpublic schools teach too much religion. The Catholic school curriculum is limited because of financial reasons. I think non-public-school people think highly of the public school system. Catholic school officials admire and like us." All three agreed that involvement of non-public-school children in title I activities would serve the educational needs of the community.

State constitutional and statutory provisions are creating greater imbalance between the two systems. Both exist side by side to provide educational opportunities. Both play an enormous role in transmitting our cultural heritage and enriching it. Under present State legislation this is impossible.

CASE S-8

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This South Central State contains 410 independent school districts. The maximum ESEA title I allocation for fiscal year 1966, based on a per pupil rate of $152.54, was $22,600,021.32. The SEA evaluation report indicates that 90 percent of this sum was spent on title I projects for that year.

TABLE 55.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-8*

Number of children eligible	148, 158
Number of public school children participating	167, 710
Number of nonpublic school children participating	1, 499
Number of nonschool participants	3, 074
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1. 16
Expenditure per participant (90 percent allotment)	$118.06
Title I expenditure rank	3(17)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	9(28)

The State evaluation for fiscal year 1966 notes, "Geographic factors separate the State into two socioeconomic groups: The mountainous area with practically no Negro population and the delta area with a high percentage of educationally deprived children.

The State is divided into 75 counties. Assuming compliance with civil rights requirements, all counties were entitled to receive financial assistance from title I ESEA.

The State has constitutional provisions for use of public resources for private purposes under certain conditions; namely, the two-thirds vote of the members of each branch of legislature. However, the same constitutional provisions explicitly prohibit appropriations of money or property to privately controlled schools or institutions, without legislative action.

Organization for title I programs at the State level took place early in July 1965. The State commissioner of education and the State director of ESEA conducted preprogram informational conferences in 11 sections of the State for the benefit of public school administrators and other interested individuals. In October 1965, the State director and members of his staff conducted statewide regional conferences for these same groups. Project application forms and tentative State guidelines were distributed.

Nonpublic participation was initiated at this time. In an interview the diocesan superintendent stated that he had attended one of the regional meetings and had discussed the matter with the commissioner of education. However, the diocesan superintendent regards his responsibilities as being similar to those of the State commissioner. The major responsibility for administering the school rests with pastors and the principals. There is no diocesan director of government programs.

Practically no communication between the public and nonpublic school systems at the State level existed before ESEA enactment. The public sector initiated communications which have steadily improved, and correspondence from school administrators at the local level to the diocesan office indicates that LEA officials have been most cooperative.

According to the State evaluation (fiscal year 1966), "non-public-school children were not included in some approved applications because: (1) Civil rights compliance was not met, and (2) a lack of desire on the part of some nonpublic schools to participate in this program."

Thus far, both public and nonpublic personnel agree that there have been no legal problems related to title I. The prospects of any are diminishing.

Efforts to include non-public-school officials on an advisory basis were frequent, but participation of non-public-school personnel at the State level was negligible.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The county in which the school district under study is located is in the delta section of the State where need for ESEA title I funds is great.

TABLE 56.—*LEA data, case No. S–8*

Number of children eligible	1612
Number of public school children participating	940
Number of nonpublic school children participating	44
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:0.61
Expenditure per participant	$152.54
Title I expenditure rank	5 (16)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	9 (28)

The local school district selected is one of six in the county. This LEA administers 13 school buildings. As shown in table 56, in fiscal year 1966, 984 children (5–17) were identified as educationally deprived. Nine hundred and forty of them were enrolled in public schools, grades 1–12. Forty-four of them were enrolled in nonpublic schools, grades 1–8. There are no nonpublic secondary schools in this school district. The number of eligible children remained the same for fiscal year 1967. The maximum LEA allotment for fiscal year 1966 was $150,099.36 and for fiscal year 1967, $124,582. In fiscal year 1966, 99.9 percent of the allotment was used.

In November 1965, one project entitled "Special Programs" was approved. Subsequently three amendments to this project were approved. The programs included evaluation services of a psychological educational, and social nature; health services; special education; parent-group sessions; and remedial services during a summer school program. Thirteen staff members who worked full time or more than half time and five staff members who worked half time or less were employed for the title I program.

Health services, pupil personnel services, and psychological services were rendered by public school personnel to eligible children at the non-public-school building when and if this service was requested by non-public-school personnel. The data obtained as a result of the diagnostic testing program were used "as the basis for the introduction of a remedial program into our curriculum," stated a principal of one of the nonpublic schools. However, the eligible non-public-school children from this same building were unable to take advantage of the free lunch program because they would have had to travel to the public school in order to eat the meal.

Principals from public and nonpublic schools disagree with one another with respect to the involvement of local non-public-school officials in the orientation and planning phase of the project. The LEA coordinator of title I agreed with the public school principals, "Non-public-school personnel were included in some planning groups * * * generally interest was not too great * * * they were relatively receptive and satisfied with the focus of the project. Inservice programs were concerned primarily with improving the operational level of certain key instructional personnel in the public schools. For this reason non-public-school teachers were not eligible for inservice programs. Two non-public-school principals were interviewed. Neither one had taken part in any kind of orientation for title I or in any planning of the program which was ultimately funded. Both administered schools attended by eligible children.

During fiscal year 1967 the approved program which was a continuation of that funded in fiscal year 1966 was enlarged to include art, music, speech therapy, physical education, and special education for the handicapped. This enrichment part of the program was not offered to eligible non-public-school children. The fiscal year 1967 LEA application form explains, "since the number of personnel in this activity is limited, students from nonpublic schools have not been participating." Each public school participant is receiving 30 to 40 minutes of instruction per week for 36 weeks in each of the enrichment areas.

In fiscal year 1966 non-public-school participation in ESEA title I was minimal. The approved program for fiscal year 1967 provides for enrichment experiences and instruction which is not available to nonpublic school children who are eligible for these services.

Two-way communication was almost nonexistent prior to title I. Since then, dialog has been encouraged by a mutual understanding of and respect for one another's system of education. One non-public-school principal remarked during an interview, "Communications are very good, but participation is very little."

The LEA coordinator judged the "cooperation between the public and non-public-school personnel to be excellent." One public school principal said "* * * excellent rapport. The educational program is sound and the personnel are well qualified. We are happy for non-public-school involvement." A non-public-school principal of a school enrolling several eligible children stated: "At present we feel the public school personnel and programs are very good and we desire to participate in joint programs." "Most of the 150 children enrolled in this school come from families having an income of $3,000 or less," said another non-public-school principal of a school in which less than a sixth were identified by the State to be eligible.

There are no legal problems at the local level. Any minor concern over the church-state issue appears to be diminishing.

Several recommendations for improving participation were offered:

1. An increase in ESEA title I appropriations.
2. More definite guidelines concerning:
    (*a*) Nonpublic school student participation.
    (*b*) Use of non-public-school property and personnel.
    (*c*) Successful approaches which would result in a more equitable non-public-school student participation.
3. Inservice training for nonpublic school teachers on an equal basis with similar training of qualified public school teachers.
4. Loan of educational facilities and equipment.
5. More equitable sharing in the services guaranteed by ESEA, title I legislation.
6. Recognition of professional status of nonpublic schoolteachers and subsequent use of their specialized services.

A local physican who is a member of the board of education thought that the community was not knowledgeable about the title I program. He was not aware of improved communications between the two systems. Personally, he was aware of certain causes which hampered more equitable participation, such as religion, competition between the two school systems, and the low quality of education in the South.

CASE S-9

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This case pertains to a small community in a Midwestern State. The maximum amount authorized for title I projects in fiscal year 1966 was $2,139,791.33, based on a per pupil rate of $200.44. Other basic data for the State are summarized in table 57.

TABLE 57.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-9*

Number of children eligible	34,525
Number of public school children participating	37,289
Number of nonpublic school children participating	4,729
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.22
Expenditure per participant	$117.86
Title I expenditure rank	4 (18)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	5 (18)

The SEA, before it approved a grant, determined that the LEA provided sufficient opportunity for the participation of educationally deprived children enrolled in private schools and residing in the district.

The requirements of ESEA were interpreted by the State to apply to the total LEA program, not necessarily to each project. The LEA application for each project was obliged to show the degree and manner of expected participation by eligible non-public-school children. Because of State statutory limitations, activities and services for which the public schools are eligible are expected to be more numerous and varied than the projects in which non-public-school children may participate. Local officials were informed that they must make services which are funded under title I available to non-public-school children in their districts.

The State department of education could not approve applications from local school boards for programs or projects in which a public school board proposed to send one or more of its teachers to instruct students on the premises of a nonpublic school.

The State school board opposed an amendment to the constitution which could have permitted local school districts the right to allow parochial school students to ride the public school buses. This stand antagonized the Catholic school superintendents throughout the State.

The coordinator of State government programs and the director of title I formed the fiscal year 1966 application review committee. The criteria employed were primarily the Federal guidelines. Projects that were general aid to the district rather than specific aid to educationally deprived children were turned down. Non-public-school officials were not invited to review or endorse applications at the State level. Major reasons for nonparticipation of non-public-school children in title I projects throughout the State were: Scheduling problems, additional expense of transportation, and the belief that "if the parochial school children go to the public schools, they may not choose to come back (to the parochial schools)." The State title I director is trying to make sure that the intent of title I legislation is being met in fiscal year 1967 by on-the-spot visits to the local school districts.

The relationship between public and nonpublic school personnel was described by the State title I director in these words: "They go their way, and we go ours." Since title I, the State department of education is cooperating with nonpublic schools. The diocesan superintendents hired an attorney to represent Catholic interests in negotiating a fair share of ESEA funds.

The Catholic sector has complained about not being involved in title I planning of the projects in which non-public-school children will participate. The policy of the SEA director is that the non-public-school administrators should bo to the public schools in the local districts and get involved in the planning of projects. "It is their responsibility to initiate communication." The director insists that the needs of eligible non-public-school children be considered in the planning of title I projects.

Participation by parochial school children during fiscal year 1966 was weak, but participation in the summer projects was considerably better. The State department of education was unable to account for these differences. It was the director's opinion that the public school administrators should include non-public-school officials before title I programs are planned. "They should plan the program together."

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The title I program provided for remedial reading and arithmetic projects and a vocational training project. These activities were continued in fiscal year 1967.

TABLE 58.—*LEA data, case No. S-9*

Number of children eligible	606
Number of public school children participating	504
Number of nonpublic school children participating	165
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: participant ratio	1:1.10
Expenditure per participant	$124.40
Title I expenditure rank	7(23)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	5(18)

The local school system selected for this study is one of four public school districts in a county situated near the northeastern borderline of the State.

The average percentage of deprived pupils for the district was reported to be 13 percent. All elementary schools having a higher concentration than the district average were designated to be eligible attendance areas. The No. 1 and No. 2 schools were named as the sites for the remedial projects. Students from the remainder of the district, both public and nonpublic, in need of remedial work, were encouraged to attend. The title I program focused on the following schools:

School	Total enrollment	Percent economically deprived
1	344	45
2	321	20
3	652	20
4	1,107	(1)
5	1,036	(1)

[1] Not available.

It was the stated intention of *LEA* authorities to invite and encourage students from the entire area which had been designated as the project area to participate. This included a Lutheran elementary school and two Catholic schools. The remedial program can be described as a series of classes for groups of six or eight students. They meet three times a week for one-half-hour sessions. After diagnosing educational weaknesses, a program was developed which would eliminate these deficiencies. The vocational program was designed to help those students who would terminate their schooling either before or immediately after graduation from high school. The chief objective was to make these courses interesting and practical and to provide some training in salable skills.

After public school officials surveyed local schools, visited classroom teachers, and accepted recommendations from principals, the needs of the students were ranked in priority. The most urgent needs were for remedial work, for vocational training, and for special education in the junior and senior high schools. The public school officials first identified the children who were educationally deprived and then proceeded to identify those children who would benefit most by the remedial work and special education programs. The participating nonpublic schools included a Catholic elementary school, a Lutheran elementary school, and a Catholic secondary school.

The maximum basic grant for fiscal year 1966 was $121,542. The total amount expended was $73,226. The funds approved for the remedial program amounted to $47,200, but $27,276 was actually spent. Per-pupil cost for this activity was $43.02. An amount of $55,310 was approved for the vocational training project. A total of of $45,950 was expended at a per-pupil cost of $1,312.86.

	Fiscal year 1966 application	Fiscal year 1966 evaluation	Fiscal year 1967 application [1]
Remedial reading:			
Public	410	484	------------
Nonpublic	245	150	------------
Neither	------------	------------	------------
Vocational training:			
Public	475	20	------------
Nonpublic	225	15	------------
Neither	35	------------	------------

[1] Not available.

In the vocational training program the discrepancy between the projected enrollment reported in the application and the actual enrollment reported in the evaluation form is extreme. Both projects took place on weekends and during the summer on public school grounds. In fiscal year 1967 the remedial classes were held during the regular school day.

Prior to the inception of the title I program, a meeting was held by the State department of education at which the public and non-public-school administrators were informed of their rights under ESEA of 1965. Catholic school administrators attended, but the Lutheran principal was not invited to attend. In general, the Lutheran principal thought that the Lutheran schools in the State were not included in the State department of education's communication network.

Following the State-level meeting, the LEA director contacted the diocesan superintendent, who is also the principal of the participating Catholic high school, and informed him about the kinds of title I projects which local school board members might agree to. Non-public-school officials were informed of the availability of three projects for nonpublic students. The general mode of operation for title I was that the public school personnel had established the program and then had informed the parochial school principals of the possibility of participation. The non-public-school principals were not consulted about their needs or about the final focus of the title I projects. The title I coordinator made efforts "on several occasions" to try to orient non-public-school personnel to the title I program. This orientation was directed to representatives of the Catholic and Lutheran schools.

The justification for the title I projects was based on the needs of the public school students in every case. The overriding philosophy of the LEA coordinator was that "the majority of needy students should dictate the limits and focus of title I projects."

The diocesan superintendent stated that the public school personnel have not consulted with him in 2 years concerning title I. Neither the principal of the Catholic elementary school nor the principal of the Lutheran school has heard from the LEA coordinator since the summer of 1966. The Lutheran principal expressed his desire to get involved in title I projects, but he has not been briefed about the fiscal year 1967 program. He feels that the minimal participation of Lutheran students in the program derives from the poor communication between the LEA coordinator and himself. The diocesan superintendent suggested that the public sector considers parochial school children as second-class citizens who should fit themselves into public school title I projects.

Prior to November 1965, the local school board was unalterably opposed to taking Federal funds. The preplanning for title I projects was rushed in order to try to have a program in operation by spring of 1966. The LEA title I coordinator, describing these events, stated that there was no time to consult non-public-school personnel before planning the program, and that only incidentally were the needs of the non-public-school students sought out or identified. The diocesan superintendent agreed to support proposals, 11 in all, for projects to be presented to the school board. The board approved the projects in terms of priorities reflecting what they thought was most important. The results did not agree with either the LEA coordinator's or the diocesan superintendent's priority lists.

Non-public-school teachers received no in-service training; however, public school teachers participated in several orientation programs pertaining to title I projects. In the future the LEA coordinator proposed that both public and non-public-school teachers should be involved in the in-service training sessions.

In short, non-public-school personnel were not involved in any planning phases. Communication was minimal between the Catholic and Lutheran school representatives and the LEA title I coordinator. The only vehicle of communication between the two systems was a periodic reporting of the number of parochial school students participating in title I projects. The coordinator stated that he did not want the parochial school to adopt a "dumping attitude" toward title I projects.

In fiscal year 1966 the title I remedial projects were scheduled on Saturday mornings. There was a large enrollment of parochial school students in this project. In fiscal year 1967 the groups in the remedial reading program were set up on the basis of ability. These classes were scheduled during the regular schoolday because public school personnel felt this was better, educationally, for the public school students. During the school year, 1966–67, there were no non-public-school students participating in the elementary school title I projects, since these projects were scheduled at times and places that made it impossible for non-public-school students to enroll, and the non-public-school principals were not informed of the existence of the projects.

The distance between schools and the lack of congruence between schedules were factors which minimized participation by non-public-school students. The diocesan superintendent suggested that a title I public school teacher rendering service in the parochial school building would be the most effective means of participating in the project.

Shared services, of this nature, are prohibited by the State constitution. The time and location of the summer projects were factors which contributed to greater participation for the Lutheran and Catholic school children who were eligible to share in these activities.

The LEA title I coordinator and the Lutheran school administrator considered the climate for cooperation between public and nonpublic schools to be good. Catholic school personnel described the climate as "isolationism." The public and nonpublic schools go their separate ways. There is no antagonism or hostility between public and nonpublic-school officials; there is merely a lack of interest in any communication. The title I coordinator explained that the administration of the title I program was an additional responsibility for him. Very likely this factor has contributed to the lack of initiative on his part to establish communication with the nonpublic sector. "Involving people takes time," and he doesn't have the time.

Since the advent of title I, the diocesan superintendent felt that communication had improved. The interchange was purely informational, but there had not been any degree of understanding between the two sectors.

Lack of qualified personnel presented a major problem. The LEA coordinator was forced to cutback the enrollment of non-public-school children. An offer by the elementary school principal of one of the Catholic schools to supply teachers for the title I projects was rejected by the LEA coordinator: "If we need you or your staff, we will call you." Shortage of qualified personnel, scheduling problems, and geographic location of title I projects were operational factors that inhibited the participation of non-public-school children in title I projects.

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in the evaluation of any title I projects. They did not review evaluation reports before they were submitted to the State department of education. As in the planning and operation, the non-public-school administrators were excluded from all phases of evaluation.

The LEA coordinator felt that the programs were effective in meeting the needs of non-public-school students; however, non-public-school personnel (both Lutheran and Catholic) stated that there was no significant progress in accommodating the needs of eligible non-public-school children. The lack of involvement of non-public-school teachers and administrators in title I activities has generated very little interest on their part in the program. The fact that non-public-school children were excluded from the remedial reading project has caused a non-public-school official to remark, "exclusion from the project ruined any good that past efforts might have accomplished."

According to the diocesan superintendent, one of the main barriers to non-public-school participation is the fact that he was not and still is not involved in planning the projects. This attitude, "Here it is, take it or leave it," was criticized by both Lutheran and Catholic school officials.

The public school officials are somewhat confused by the organization of the non-public-school systems. They are not always certain of the identity of the non-public-school authorities with whom they should communicate. The diocesan superintendent of secondary schools is the identifiable referent for the parochial schools in the community, although he admitted he did not communicate with the Sister principal of the nonpublic elementary school. This same individual is also the government programs representative for the Archbishop. The elementary school principal feels that this situation is regrettable. Although this liaison person is communicating about the needs of all eligible non-public-school children, "* * * he does not understand the needs of the elementary school students." A problem not only is evident with communications between the public and non-public-school personnel, but with the organization of the non-public-school administration—in particular, with that of the diocesan school system.

CASE S-10

I. STATE CHARACTERISTICS

This case involves a county school system in a Western State. The maximum amount authorized was $1,463,660.10, based on a per pupil rate of $257.46. Other basic data for the State are summarized in table 59.

TABLE 59.—*SEA Basic State data, case No. S-10*

Number of children eligible	5, 685
Number of public school children participating	14, 954
Number of nonpublic school children participating	766
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:2. 77
Expenditure per participant	$83. 18
Title I expenditure rank	9(27)
State expenditure (1963-64) rank	3(7)

Non-public-school officials were invited to attend all State and area meetings. Project applications are not considered acceptable without a statement from non-public-school officials indicating that they have been contacted by the local school officials and that nonpublic students who qualify will be included in project activities.

There were no major constitutional problems. There was a question on "shared time" and the Attorney General ruled that such an arrangement was not in conflict with State law. The State constitution does not prohibit the use of title I funds for nonpublic children, but the money must be kept separate.

Non-public-school officials were not invited to review or endorse title I applications at the State level. A complete lack of communication between public and nonpublic State officials exists in the State. "The State title I Director did not know there was a diocesan government program director." It is the general policy of the SEA title I director that consultation between public and nonpublic administrators on matters related to title I be done at the local level.

The diocesan coordinator of Federal programs attended all workshops and meetings of the State department of education. He was not aware of how the program at RS, which is the focus of this case study, was planned, but he suggested to the parochial school personnel in RS that they insist on a title I teacher coming to their schools. This suggestion was not accepted by the pastors.

On a diocesan basis it was decided to push for remedial reading. The need of the non-public-school students for a remedial reading program was decided primarily on the basis of the opinions of the principals of the parochial school system. The diocesan coordinator "was not consulted in the design of the project or in the decision of the final focus of any projects in the State," nor was he involved in the gathering or reporting of data concerning eligible nonpublic pupils on the State level. No non-public-school officials were involved in title I evaluations. There were no baseline data collected on nonpublic pupils.

The archdiocesan superintendent is located in another State. This placed the diocesan coordinator in a unique situation; there was no superintendent for the diocese in this State. The SEA title I staff had no meetings with the archdiocesan superintendent or any representatives of his staff. There are no formal lines of communication between the State department of education and the State's nonpublic schools. The general attitude toward communication with non-public-school officials at the State level is primarily for "public relations" purposes. The diocesan coordinator felt that title I "has helped the relationship between public and nonpublic schools in the State because it has facilitated communication with the State title I coordinator." Prior to title I there was no relationship between the State department of education and diocesan school officials. The diocesan coordinator indicated that since title I "the nonpublic officials have been consistently more informed at least in relation to what is going on in Federal programs." This improvement in communication was described as "informal." Title I officials have never sought the advice of the diocesan coordinator. The communication between the public and nonpublic sectors is primarily one way.

The SEA title I director and his staff also felt that "informal" communication has improved since title I. Before title I there was no communication between the State department of education and nonpublic administrators. Since title I the State department is conveying more information, but not necessarily communicating more with the nonpublic sector. To cite an example indicating a lack of communication, when non-public-school children were not included on a project application, the title I director "assumed that the non-public-school administrators were not interested." It was his opinion that it was the nonpublic-school administrators' choice; and, if they were not listed, they must have chosen not to be. He surmised that non-public-school administrators who did not participate were probably against Federal aid because certain LEA's did not participate for that same reason.

The diocesan coordinator suggested that communication between public and non-public-school officials should be improved to carry out the intent of the legislation. He advocated greater participation by nonpublic administrators in planning and evaluation in order to increase the effectiveness of title I projects. Concerning administrative procedure within the Catholic school system, he now feels that it would be better for each local school to decide its own needs and convey these to the public school officials, rather than having an overall diocesan decision.

The diocesan coordinator considers RS to have a better than average relationship between public and nonpublic schools, because of a high Catholic population (36 percent), and the fact that many members of that school board are Catholic. The public school superintendent of RS is also a Catholic. This has had various ramifications in the public-nonpublic relationship.

II. LOCAL CHARACTERISTICS

The title I project provided remedial reading and arithmetic instruction for the school year and summer term. Supplementary services included psychological and health services in addition to a classroom for the emotionally disturbed.

The fiscal year 1967 title I project was a continuation of the 1966 project. Remedial arithmetic was dropped and the program consisted of remedial reading and special education.

The title I program was focused on six public elementary schools:

School	Enrollment	Percent economically deprived	Number economically deprived	Number educationally deprived
1	260	8.1	21	31
2	161	8.0	13	31
3	351	4.8	17	41
4	166	4.8	8	28
5	414	4.6	19	63
6	70	4.3	3	14

RS has nine schools operated by the LEA with a total enrollment of 2,345.

The needs of the students were ranked in priority: reading, arithmetic, retarded, nutrition, preschool. These needs were ascertained from a study of achievement test scores, teachers' comments, grades, and counseling records. In particular, children in remedial reading were referred by their regular class teachers. The needs of the nonpublic children were not considered and the public personnel selected solely on teacher recommendations. Students from three nonpublic schools participated.

The planning and administrative preparation took place between October 1965 and January 1966. The project (fiscal year 1966) extended from January 17, 1966, to July 15, 1966. The project (fiscal year 1967) covered the period August 13, 1966, to May 26, 1967.

The maximum basic grant in 1966 and 1967 was $45,570. The full amount was approved for the fiscal year 1966 project; $38,851 was approved for fiscal year 1967.

TABLE 60.—*LEA data, case No. S–10*

Number of children eligible	178
Number of public school children participating	211
Number of nonpublic school children participating	135
Number of nonschool participants	0
Eligible: Participant ratio	1:1.94
Expenditure per participant	$131.71
Title I expenditure rank	6 (22)
State expenditure (1963–64) rank	3 (7)

The project took place on public facilities only during the regular school day and summer.

The bishop held a meeting in August 1965 at which he explained ESEA to both pastors and principals in the diocese. In November 1965 the parochial school personnel requested a meeting with the superintendent of RS to "express their desire to cooperate in the program."

The parochial school representatives were asked the needs of their pupils, and they urged a remedial reading program. The public school personnel had decided prior to the meeting that their program would include remedial reading, etc. The parochial school personnel presented no specific proposals, outside of remedial reading.

In December 1965 the LEA title I coordinator visited the two parochial principals and informed them of the nature of ESEA. Before January 1966 the superintendent and title I coordinator held a meeting of all faculty in the public school system and explained Government programs. "There were no non-public-school personnel included in any of the meetings related to title I programs." The nonpublic principals stated that no one discussed title I provisions for nonpublic schools.

There is a mutual willingness in both sectors to involve the nonpublic schools in title I, but there is a lack of initiative. The LEA coordinator felt that the parochial administrators seem to resist having any formal meetings with the title I coordinator. They are not included on any title I committees, because the coordinator "assumed" that the nonpublic peronnel "would not want to give up their time to attend meetings." He thought he would have a representative of nonpublic schools on future application and evaluation committees.

The nonpublic personnel had little or no involvement in the detailed planning of title I projects. As the superintendent commented, "They seemed to be satisfied with the programs that this office decided upon." For the future the superintendent feels "that they should be involved in the planning of projects and probably should sit on committees." This attitude of cooperation is not reflected in the planning for fiscal year 1967. As the coordinator stated, when the applications were in preparation the pastors indicated that they "liked what they had last year and would like the program continued." The superintendent offered the explanation that in fiscal year 1966 "the rush of getting the title I application prepared made it impossible to involve the nonpublic officials in planning." The planning was and is centralized with the title I coordinator and he "determined the needs and final focus of the title I projects himself."

The principals of both Catholic schools expressed a desire for title I remedial reading projects that would begin in the primary grades. The project is directed toward the intermediate grades. This request concided with the suggestions of the public principals. This suggestion was rejected by the superintendent who felt that remedial reading was necessary in the intermediate grades. It was then that the nonpublic officials "learned that we were fit into the preestablished program set up by the public schools under title I. It is fortunate that our needs are in some way similar." The pastors were consulted about the needs of the parochial school students to the extent that the LEA title I staff "stated to them that there were specific educational needs in the public schools and asked whether the proposed programs would also meet the needs of the parochial schools." The project applications were submitted to the pastors for review before they were submitted to the State department of education.

The superintendent suggested that communication should be improved and indicated that the fault probably lies with his office; but he further pointed out that he believes that the needs of public school pupils—"since they are in the majority"—should dictate the focus of the program. This attitude is also held by the coordinator of title I who stated:

> Preference should be given to the public school students because of the representation of community.

In planning the projects the title I staff "did not consider the nonpublic-personnel pupil needs, etc. The parochial school children who were referred for participation in the project were evaluated and if eligible were "placed on a list according to greatest needs and entered the program accordingly." The parochial schools did not participate in the all-day emotionally disturbed or special-education projects, since pupils from these schools could attend only in the morning. The times and places of the project sessions were determined by the public school officials, and nonpublic schools had to fit into the prearranged public school schedule. An elementary parochial school principal requested that a title I teacher conduct sessions in her building, but this request was denied because there were no personnel available. It was decided that it would be more economical to send parochial students to the public schools. However, the title I activities were not scheduled at times convenient for nonpublic participation in title I.

There was much greater non-public-school-student participation in the summer project, and there were more personnel available during the summer. The superintendent felt that, "if they (parochial school pupils) did not need to be taken out of their school, there would be greater participation during the school year." Also, the distance of one parochial school from the project school hindered participation. This necessitated busing the non-public-school children to the public school. The parochial school had to contract its own bus service. For fiscal year 1966, $30 was alloted in the title I budget and $100 in fiscal year 1967 for bus service. During the summer there was no need to bus the nonpublic students.

The proximity of the other parochial school to the title I project school increased participation, but this was also limited by the establishment of a quota for parochial school students. During fiscal year 1966 and fiscal year 1967 the school was alloted a quota of students who could participate in the remedial reading programs. This year the quota was nine.

There were no title I activities carried out in the nonpublic schools, apart from testing and screening of eligible pupils, and guidance evaluation.

The figures for nonpublic pupils were originally based on guesses by the pastors. There is a discrepancy in the figures for both public and nonpublic from application to evaluation. The main hindrances to full nonpublic participation were a lack of qualified personnel in the overall operation of title I, and the time scheduling of projects.

Before title I, there was little communication between public and nonpublic school officials. The climate was aptly described as "friendly indifference."

The nonpublic education organization is beset with some problems related to title I. It is a question of authority—who is in charge of nonpublic education? "The public school people may have trouble in establishing communication with the parochial school because they are not really sure who runs the school—the pastor or the sister-principal."

There has been more communication between both public and nonpublic-school officials since title I projects began. The nature of the communication can be described as information sharing or an "exchange of facts." It does not go beyond this point and contact is still relatively infrequent.

The public school superintendent felt that nonpublic pupils should be involved in title I projects because it is "good public relations." This attitude is also reflected on the State level. "Since the community is primarily Catholic, it makes them feel that they are getting something for their money." The superintendent stated that "since the allotment is based primarily upon the numbers of educationally deprived youngsters who are in attendance at public schools, this factor should have something to do with limiting the participation of non-public-school children."

Non-public-school personnel were not involved in project evaluations. The nonpublic school did not receive copies of evaluation reports, but neither did the public school principals.

Little consideration was given to a need for base line data from parochial schools. The parochial schools had base line data, but they were not requested.

The LEA coordinator stated that the remedial education project was successful and met the needs of both the public and nonpublic students. Yet "because of the way the project has been established, the low-average pupil with a reading problem is not being helped by the program." These pupils need remedial reading help more than those selected for the project. Both public and nonpublic principals are of this opinion.

The public school principals proposed "mutual planning" which would give them greater involvement in developing projects.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS, SUMMARY, AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents an analysis of the quantitative data which are reported in the tables of chapters II, III, and IV. It then reports the implications for SEA's which can be drawn from the case studies in terms of legal problems, administrative relationship changes, and extent of involvement of non-public-school officials and children. The data pertaining to LEA's are examined from the point of view of administrative relationship changes, extent of involvement of non-public-school personnel, and the general thrust of the projects which have been funded under title I. The final section of this chapter is devoted to the conclusions and recommendations which are suggested by the preceding analyses.

A. Analysis of Quantitative Data

The formula which was used to compute maximum basic grants under title I for fiscal year 1966 contained a factor which was defined as "one-half the average per pupil expenditure in the State for the second preceding year." This factor multiplied by the total of the children in the State who are aged 5 through 17 and who (*a*) come from families with an annual income of less than $2,000, or (*b*) come from families with dependent children under title IV of the Social Security Act, determined the maximum basic grants. Consequently, information on this factor is useful, not only in establishing the representativeness of the sample used in this study, but also in studying the relationship of this factor to other aspects of title I programs in the SEA's and LEA's which were surveyed in the present investigation.

In the 10 States which were represented by large LEA's, this factor ranged from a high of $365.64 to a low of $146.36. For States from which a medium-sized LEA was drawn in the present sampling, the value of the factor had a high of $287.79 and a low of $155.73. The States which contain the small LEA's had a maximum value for this factor of $275.75 and a minimum value of $121.20. It is apparent, then, that an eligible child in one SEA in the sample had an allotment that was more than three times as large as the allotment made for a child in another SEA.

It seemed useful to raise questions such as: Is there any relationship between the funds per eligible pupil which an SEA received and the amount per pupil actually expended in title I projects in that State? Did this relationship vary as a function of the size of the LEA's drawn from the 30 States?

In the States represented by large LEA's the per participant expenditures had a range from $255.09 to $73.89; for States represented by medium-sized LEA's the range was from $375.73 to $32.94; and for States in which small LEA's were sampled the average cost per participant for title I projects was between $174.19 and $80.91. Even on an inspectional basis it was obvious that there was little relationship between the amount per eligible pupil allotted to SEA's and their average cost per participant. For example, the State which spent $73.89 per pupil in title I projects received $238.34 for each eligible child, and the State which expended $375.73 on each title I participant had its maximum basic grant calculated on the basis of $287.79 for each eligible child in the 5 to 17 age range. These discrepancies reflect differences in the ratios of the number of eligible children to the number of children who were actually enrolled in projects. The data for these variables, expressed as rank order correlation coefficients, are summarized in table 61.

TABLE 61.—*Rank order correlations between one-half State average per pupil expenditure (1963–64) and SEA expenditure per participant in title I projects*

Group:	*Rho*
States represented by large LEA	–0.12
States represented by medium LEA	.47
States represented by small LEA	.20
Total	.29

All the values of rho shown in table 61 fail to achieve statistical significance at the 0.05 level. There is apparently only a chance relationship between the cost factor used in determining State allocations and the per participant cost of title I programs.

Another relevant question which was studied was: Do SEA's with relatively high expenditures per participant also have relatively high percentages of non-public-school pupils enrolled in title I programs? The appropriate analysis, summarized in table 62, indicates no significant relationship between these variables for any of the 30 States, regardless of whether they were represented by a large, medium, or small LEA.

TABLE 62.—*Rank order correlations between SEA expenditure per participant and State rank for percent of non-public-school participants in title I projects*

Group:	*Rho*
States represented by large LEA	0.13
States represented by medium LEA	.48
States represented by small LEA	.32
Total	.24

Turning now to the data for LEA's, there were again marked discrepancies in the per-pupil expenditure for title I participants, both within and among the three size levels for LEA's. In the 10 large LEA's the cost per pupil for title I activities ranged from $280.95 to $47: for medium size LEA's from $408.72 to $33.13; and for small LEA's from $316.54 to $89.14. It is of interest to note that the allocation for the LEA which expended $33.13 per title I pupil was calculated on the basis of $173.68 per eligible child, while the LEA which expended $316.54 per participant had its maximum basic grant calculated on the basis of $262.15. Some LEA's expended substantially more per participant than the value of the factor used to compute the maximum grant, while other LEA's spent an amount for each participant that was considerably lower than the factor. These differences reflect disparities in the ratios between the number of eligible children and the number of children who actually participated in title I projects in the various LEA's.

In order to study the relationship between the amount of money expended by LEA's for each participating child and the degree to which non-public-school children were involved in projects, rank order correlations were computed for those factors separately for the three groupings of 10 LEA's, and for the total sample of 30 cases. The data are summarized in table 63.

TABLE 63.—*Rank order correlations between LEA expenditure per participant and LEA rank for percent of non-public-school participants in title I projects*

LEA classification:	*Rho*
Large	0.50
Medium	.11
Small	—.22
Total	—.01

None of the rho's is statistically significant, and it is concluded that there is no systematic relationship between the LEA's per-pupil expenditure and the percentage of participants drawn from nonpublic schools.

In the large LEA's the expenditure per participant ranged from $280.95 to $47; in medium LEA's the highest was $408.72 and the lowest expenditure was $33.13; in small LEA's the per-pupil costs of title I projects fell between $316.54 and $89.14.

The percentage of total participants in title I projects who were enrolled in nonpublic schools were as follows for large, medium, and small LEA's respectively: 23.53 to 1.78 percent, 20.71 to 0.00 percent, and 41.91 to 0.00 percent.

Another possible relationship which was of interest to the project staff was the correlation between the percent of non-public-school participants and the ratio of eligible to participant students for the various LEA's. Did LEA's in which participants substantially outnumbered the quota of eligible children also enroll high percentages of pupils from nonpublic schools, or was the discrepancy between eligible children and participating children attributable to large numbers of pupils drawn from public school settings? The eligible participant ratios for large LEA's extended from 1:3.19 to 1:0.71: in medium LEA's it ranged from 1: 5.25 to 1: 0.60; and in small LEA's from 1:2.33 to 1:0.61.

The data pertaining to this analysis are summarized in table 64.

TABLE 64.—*Rank order correlation between LEA percent of non-public-school participants and LEA eligible-participation ratio*

LEA classification:	*Rho*
Large	—0.25
Medium	.02
Small	[1].66
Total	.10

[1] Significant at 0.05 level.

The rho coefficient for the relationship between the percent of non-public-school participants and the magnitude of the eligible: participant ratio was statistically significant at the 0.05 level for small

LEA's, but the hypothesis of no relationship is accepted for the large and medium LEA's. In small LEA's high eligible: participant ratios tended to be associated with a high percentage of participants from nonpublic schools, but in the total sample these factors are independent.

The analyses of the foregoing data do not indicate any consistent pattern of differences between SEA's represented by large, medium, and small LEA's. In addition, they fail to establish any significant relationships for SEA's between (1) the fiscal factor used in determining maximum basic grants and (2) expenditure per participant, or between (1) SEA expenditures per participant and (2) the percent of participants in title I projects who came from nonpublic schools. Nor do LEA's in the three size classifications manifest any statistically significant degree of correlation between (1) their per-pupil expenditures for title I activities and (2) the degree of involvement of non-public-school students, or between (1) the ratio of eligible to participating children and (2) the percent of non-public-school participants. The involvement of non-public-school children in title I projects in the LEA's studied is independent of the per-pupil cost and of whether or not the LEA projects enrolled more or fewer participants than the total number of eligible children used in determining allocations. The one exception to the general rule of no significant relationships was found for small LEA's where a moderately high positive relationship indicated that the degree of involvement of non-public-school children varied systematically with the disparity between the number of eligibles and the number of participants.

B. Implications of the Case Studies: State Level

1. Legal problems

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the first Federal law to give explicit recognition to the existence of nonpublic elementary schools and non-public-high schools, has been described as "combining basically irreconcilable policies into the same law."[1] It has also been asserted that some of the assumptions which underlie ESEA represent issues which require considerable study. The act, particularly in its acceptance of the shared time strategy, assumes that (*a*) the teaching of some secular components of the curriculum in public schools may be carried out in a way that poses a conflict with the basic viewpoints of some religious groups, and that (*b*) the teaching of these subjects in a manner which is not compatible with the religious beliefs of students attending church-related schools can be supported by public funds in public-school settings, but—on the other hand—nonpublic schools may not have access to public funds to teach these same secular subjects in a framework which reflects their philosophy and their interpretation of secular reality. In essence ESEA concedes that the public school is not neutral, but has a point of view of the meaning of secular reality which—at least in some points—is different from the orientation of certain religious groups.

The act assumes the existence of a plurality of American education which calls for the creation of a wholly new juridical entity—the child who is a part-time student in a public school but who, for reasons of conscience, is enrolled only

---

[1] Robert F. Drinan, review of "The Shared Time Strategy," Indiana Law Journal, 1967, p. 277.

in those courses in the public school where the instruction will not contradict his interpretation of the meaning of the secular order.[2]

Some legal experts have argued that the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act is basically an extension of the ruling which emerged from the case of *Pierce v. Society of Sisters*. The Supreme Court decision in this case that the interpretation of secular reality and nonsacred learning transmitted in private, church-related schools must be accepted by the States as a satisfactory substitute for the interpretation transmitted in a public school can be regarded as leading logically to the conclusion that schools which the State must constitutionally accept as satisfying the provisions of the State's compulsory attendance law should not be excluded from the benefits of public funds appropriated for the improvement of the schooling of educationally disadvantaged children. However, the act fails to take the next logical step of establishing a policy that the public school cannot teach a certain point of view in value-oriented subjects, especially when this practice compels a large number of parents to bypass public schooling for their children and to establish and support private denominational schools in order to have compliance with compulsory attendance laws.[3]

While ESEA recognizes and perhaps even offers some encouragement of nonpublic schools, it is clear that private schools are—for the purposes of the act—to be severely subordinated to the tax-supported schools. Almost all of the educational activities authorized by the act must take place on public school premises. Educational material and equipment may be placed in nonpublic schools only on a loan basis from the local public educational agency. The values interwoven into the fabric of the public school curriculum are regarded as being neutral, while the values inherent in the curriculums of private schools are considered to be sectarian and beyond the scope of public support.

The paradoxes, debatable assumptions, and imperfect analyses which are incorporated in ESEA have given rise to a host of legal problems and to a variety of uncertain interpretations which have hampered the implementation of the provisions of the legislation. These difficulties are compounded by the variations in State constitutions and statutes. For example, dual enrollment programs—which in the opinion of many interpreters of the legislation was intended by Congress to be the primary mechanism for involving private school children in title I projects—have been held to be contrary to State constitutions in rulings by a number of State courts and State attorneys general.

At the practical level SEA's and LEA's have been plagued by the ambiguities and imprecise definitions which characterize crucial sections of the published regulations and the legislative history of the enactment. Typical of issues which are clouded with legal uncertainty, and subject to variant interpretations, are the permissibility of including non-public-school teachers in inservice training programs, and the utilization in nonpublic schools of mobile equipment—purchased with title I funds—for projects which are not remedial in nature.

---

[2] Ibid., p. 275.
[3] Ibid., p. 276.

Information gathered by the field survey coordinators indicated that in some localities the participation of non-public-school children was impeded during fiscal year 1966 by delays in rulings of State attorneys general concerning possible conflicts between the provisions of title I and state constitutional requirements. In other settings the opinion of the legal counsel for the SEA has been accepted as a substitute for a ruling by the attorney general.

The data reported for some of the 30 cases in this study justify the conclusion that in some settings adherence to State constitutional safeguards has resulted in only token communication with the private educational sector by State education officials, and in minimal involvement of non-public-school children. This situation has prompted some non-public-school officials to question the legality of allowing such States to accept the full amount of the maximum basic grant. Instead, it was suggested that the State should be awarded only that part of the grant which reflects the number of eligible children enrolled in public schools. The balance of the grant, based on eligible children in non-public schools, would be withheld from the State until such time as the constitutional obstacles to the full implementation of title I were surmounted.

One of the SEA's included in this study has recommended that LEA's establish a method of determining the dollar amount of services provided to eligible non-public-school children. The extension of such a procedure to all SEA's would provide a basis for determining more precisely than is now possible the extent to which the comparability factor as defined in the rules and regulations is being achieved in practice.

A fact which is clearly evident in the cases examined in this study is that many local school officials, both public and private, operated during fiscal year 1966 on the basis of incomplete and even erroneous understandings of the provisions of title I and the first amendment. LEA officials in some instances denied legitimate requests by private school authorities, and in other cases the non-public-school sector sought participation in a mode that was clearly beyond the intention and purview of ESEA. Both types of actions, when they are the products of ignorance or misunderstanding, have a strong deleterious effect on the spirit of cooperation and mutual trust between the two educational systems. The need for school officials to be fully and authoritatively informed on all aspects of title I, and on the constitutional and legal context of the State, is a pressing one. The sooner the need is satisfied the earlier will harmonious working relationships between public and private schools be achieved.

The legal problems associated with the implementation of title I are formidable, complex, and emotionally charged. They directly affect the nature and extent of participation by private school pupils. This phase of the study has been able to deal with them only in a general manner, but funds from the project's appropriation for fiscal year 1967 have been assigned for an expert and intensive examination of constitutional prohibitions, statutory barriers, and legal rulings.

2. *Administrative relationship changes* (*SEA*)

The reports submitted by the field survey coordinators for this project indicated that in all 30 cases in the sample the private schools which showed the greatest interest in and expectation for the involvement of pupils in title I projects were schools conducted by the Roman Catholic Church. While available data showed some participation by pupils enrolled in schools conducted by other faiths, the numbers were extremely small. As a consequence of this fact, the analysis of administrative relationship changes at the State level is limited to a consideration of changes and needed changes in the relationships between SEA's and the officials who are responsible for Catholic schools in the State.

Catholic elementary schools in the United States are almost exclusively parochial, meaning that the support of the school is provided by the members of the parish in which the school is located. The pastor of the parish, who is responsible to the bishop of the diocese, has a considerable latitude in administrative decisions pertaining to parish-sponsored activities and agencies—including the school. The authority guaranteed to a pastor by canon law can, if not judiciously exercised, lead to problems and conflicts involving him and the principal of the school, who typically is a member of a religious community of women. Some pastors are deeply interested in the educational activities of the parish school; others could care less. Some pastors with no formal preparation as school administrators hold a tight rein on every aspect of the school's policies and practices, but others completely entrust the day-to-day, and year-to-year operation of the school to the nun who serves as principal.

Some parishes also support high schools which may be either coeducational, coinstitutional, or restricted to students of one sex. The control of the parochial high school is also included in the pastor's authority. But Catholic high schools in the United States may also be classified as interparochial, diocesan, or community sponsored. The interparochial high school is supported by funds raised by a combination of geographically adjacent parishes and is typically administered by a sister, brother, or priest. The pastors of the parishes who support the school exercise shared canonical authority over the institution.

Diocesan high schools, on the other hand, are supported by funds from the diocesan treasury. These schools typically have a principal who is appointed by the superior of the religious community which staffs the school. The principal is then responsible to the diocesan superintendent of schools in matters pertaining to the policies and practices of the school.

Private Catholic high schools differ from parochial, interparochial, and diocesan high schools in that the expenses of establishing and maintaining the school are borne by a particular religious community of men or women. These high schools are administered by a member of the community, are not under the authority of any pastor, and generally attempt to be as independent of the diocesan superintendent of schools as the local situation permits.

The overall responsibility for leadership and coordination of effort in this variegated array of educational institutions is vested in a diocesan superintendent of schools who is appointed by the bishop of the diocese.

Catholic diocesan boundaries in the United States do not cross State lines. but while some dioceses are coterminous with States, other States are divided into several dioceses. Each diocese (or archdiocese) has its own bishop (or archbishop) who appoints a diocesan superintendent of schools as the responsible agent for the formal educational activities of all the schools located within the diocesan boundaries.

In examining the impact of title I on administrative relationships between officials of public schools and of private schools at the State level, attention is therefore focused on the nature and quality of interaction between the officers of the SEA and the superintendents of schools for the dioceses located within that State. In States which contain only one diocese the Catholic school superintendent has responsibilities for the schools in a number of towns, cities, and counties, and accordingly operates in an area which is smaller than that assigned to a State superintendent of public schools, but larger than that of a city or county public school system.

An important initial observation, then, is that the administrative structures for public schools and for Catholic schools in the United States are not parallel or comparable. Consequently, contacts between administrators of the two systems involve people who are operating at different levels of responsibility, and whose channels of communications as well as official relationships with subordinates are also different. The fact that some diocesan superintendents have a staff member who serves as the official responsible for overseeing the involvement of Catholic schools in a variety of Government programs, and that in some States which contain a number of dioceses and interdiocesan organization designed to coordinate efforts on a statewide basis has been created, added to the difficulties of SEA's in determining appropriate contacts for discussions relative to the involvement of Catholic school children.

This study did not produce evidence of any internal administrative change in SEA's which would uniquely affect relationships with nonpublic schools. No SEA official, for example, was designated as a specific liaison person with non-public-school authorities. Within the administrative structure of Catholic education, however, there has been a significant increase over the past 2 years in the number of dioceses in which a coordinator of governmental programs has been appointed. Although this official has manifold responsibilities, it seems clear that in many cases his appointment was a direct outgrowth of a desire to have eligible Catholic school children participate in title I programs. The creation of statewide associations of dioceses, a trend which has also increased in recent years, is at least in part attributable to the perceived need for a centralized agency to serve as a clearinghouse to promote improved communication and to provide more effective dissemination of information to Catholic school officials at all levels. These organizations have been involved in efforts to obtain opportunities for private school students which would be substantially comparable to those provided for children in public schools.

In general, it appears that meetings involving SEA personnel and diocesan school officials relative to title I were initiated by the State coordinators and were designed to acquaint the school administrators with the State policies which were to apply to title I proposals and projects. Information relating to the procedures which were to be followed by LEA's was dispensed, and the responsibility of the LEA to involve non-public-school pupils was indicated. Typically there was no opportunity for diocesan educational officials to become involved in any way in the development of policy, or the review of project applications or evaluations. There was, of course, no requirement that the state agency should consult with private school representatives, but if SEA's had been desirous of improving the working relationships between the two educational sectors and had wanted to set a pattern for cooperation that would also be useful at the local level, the appointment of a non-public-school person in an advisory and review capacity would have been a fruitful opportunity to achieve those purposes.

Many diocesan superintendents expressed disappointment about the nature and extent of the involvement of Catholic school children in title I projects in their States during fiscal year 1966. To some extent the disappointment was mixed with uncertainty as to exactly what benefits, and how much money, should have been made available to eligible children in their schools. This uncertainty perhaps accounts for the attitude of not wanting to "rock the boat" which the field survey coordinators attributed to several diocesan superintendents. The position that obtaining at least some degree of benefit for non-public-school children was better than nothing at all was apparently not an uncommon point of view among Catholic school officials during the first round of projects.

Among the SEA's there was no agreement on the mechanism for verifying the involvement of non-public-school pupils in approved projects. Some SEA's required that signatures of endorsement from private school officials be included with project proposals. Presumably this endorsement served to indicate to the SEA that the non-public-school administrator had reviewed and approved the application in terms of the proposed number of children from his sector who were to participate, and in terms of the appropriateness of the project for meeting the needs of the eligible children in the private schools. In other cases, however, SEA's were apparently satisfied that an LEA had fulfilled the intent of ESEA if the proposal merely indicated that the project would be "available" or "open" to eligible children from the nonpublic schools.

Diocesan superintendents identified four problem areas as they considered the gamut of title I projects which had been approved in their dioceses or States. All four factors are directly related to the goal of insuring that the opportunities available to eligible private school pupils are substantially comparable to those provided for children in tax-supported schools.

The first question concerns the extent to which SEA-approved projects are geared to meet real needs of non-public-school students. Because officials of these schools were not involved in planning projects, and because SEA approvals were made without review by, or consultation with, representatives of private schools there is a clear possibility that funds are being used for many projects that bear little if any relationship to the educational needs of children who are not enrolled in the public schools. Title I projects which involve hiring additional teachers in order to reduce class size in public schools, which provide in-service training for public school teachers only, or which concentrate on the purchase of equipment which seldom finds its way into private school classrooms are regarded by diocesan school officials as projects which are not related to the needs of their students, and as projects which can even have harmful consequences for nonpublic schools. One diocesan superintendent, protesting the number of such projects which had been approved in his State, argued that title I was contributing to the creation of a severe "quality gap" between public and nonpublic schools, and predicted that if the pattern was not rectified ESEA would prove to be the death knell for Catholic education in his State.

A second area of concern, and a potential source of friction in the relationships between SEA officials and diocesan superintendents, is the general nonavailability of data concerning the extent to which expenditures within the State are comparable for educationally deprived children in the two types of schools. One of the SEA's included in the present study provided LEA's with a listing of the amount of funds authorized for that LEA specifically because of a given number of resident children from low-income families who were attending nonpublic schools. Preparation of such data by all States and the maintenance of a reasonable proportionality between funds allotted for children in the two school systems and funds expended on both types of children would not only ward off criticism but also provide a check on the extent to which comparability is actually being achieved.

An analysis of the interview protocols submitted by the field survey coordinators indicated that to the diocesan superintendents a third potentially troublesome area in their relationships with SEA officials centered on the number of private school pupils who are given the opportunity of participating in title I projects. In 24 of the 30 SEA's which were examined in this study the number of children participating in title I exceeded the number identified as eligible; in six States participants were lower in number than the total eligible. The data for one SEA show that almost 7½ times more children were enrolled in title I activities than were listed as eligible, but in another State participants numbered fewer than one-fourth of the total eligible.

Accordingly, it is clear that practice, if not philosophy, has varied from one State to another. In certain States the attempt apparently has been to provide some degree of benefit for as many children as possible. But in others where only a fraction of those eligible are listed as participating, either efforts have been made to maximize benefits by concentrating on limited numbers, or emphasis has been placed on using funds to reduce class size by employing additional teachers, or on the purchase of equipment.

Another troublesome aspect of the problem of the number of nonpublic-school students sharing title I benefits is that project applications submitted to SEA's with almost perfect consistency anticipate a larger number of private school participants than the number of actual participants from such schools shown on project evaluation forms. To some extent these discrepancies may be attributed to conflicts in scheduling or to transportation difficulties which made it inconvenient or impossible for the projected number of non-public-school children to become involved. Another factor in this situation appears to be the application of a two-pronged criterion of economic and educational deprivation for private-school children, as distinguished from the single standard of educational deprivation applied to public school students attending schools in target areas.

When SEA data for the percentage of title I participants drawn from private schools are examined a large range is found. In one SEA, private-school children constituted 19.26 percent of all participants, but in other States the percentages were less than 1 percent. However, because data for eligible children are not commonly broken down in terms of the type of school attended, it is not possible in the present study to determine whether the percentages represent equitable sharing in title I or are indicative of a failure of some States to provide substantially comparable opportunities for students in both school systems.

A final source of difficulty affecting relationships between State and diocesan officials has been alluded to previously. This is the nonaccessible character of many title I projects for children in private schools, due to the scheduling of activities at times or places which make it impossible or inconvenient for the children to attend. This appears to be a particularly troublesome factor in States where the busing of private-school students cannot be provided at public expense, and where no title I services or mobile equipment are made available on non-public-school premises.

In summary, a major impact of title I on nonpublic schools (as represented by schools sponsored by the Catholic Church) has been a recognition of the need to augment and modify the administrative structure of these schools in order to maximize the opportunity for the children attending such schools to obtain the advantages explicitly legislated for them in the ESEA of 1965. SEA's have not established any formal procedures for involving diocesan educational authorities in studying the extent to which projects serve the needs of students in private schools, nor have these officials been given any opportunity to serve as consultants in the review or evaluation of proposals and projects. The contacts between SEA's and diocesan superintendents appear to be initiated chiefly by ESEA title I coordinators and are used almost exclusively for the purpose of communicating information about practices and policies. Uncertainty about legal problems posed by ESEA and even lack of understanding of the rules and regulations during fiscal year 1966 led many diocesan superintendents to adopt a wait-and-see attitude. While relations between officials of the two sectors at the State level are generally cordial, private school authorities in most States are not satisfied that their students are obtaining the substantial comparability, specified in the legislation, with respect to number of participants, expenditure ratios, and programs designed to meet the educational needs of the eligible children in their schools. There is a general desire on the part of diocesan educational officers for greater involvement with SEA personnel, and a general conviction that a resolution of the problems which limit the participation of non-public-school children will require a closer working relationship between the two sectors than was characteristic of the operations during fiscal year 1966.

C. Implications of the case studies: Local level

1. Administrative relationships

When attention is turned from the State to the local level, the problems of communication between public and Catholic school officials recur in a greatly intensified form. One of the first questions facing LEA title I coordinators as they attempt to fulfill the requirement of including non-public-school students in their projects is: Who is the appropriate representative of Catholic education with whom to discuss the title I program in this community? Is it the diocesan superintendent of schools? He may be located hundreds of miles away, be understaffed, and simultaneously attempting to keep some kind of check on projects in scores of cities and towns. If, on the other hand, the diocesan superintendent's office was located in or near the geographical boundaries of an LEA, he was the private school official who was most frequently contacted by title I coordinators.

Officials of some LEA's, located near the diocesan see city, reported that their private school contacts were with priests who resided in the community and who served as assistant superintendents of the Catholic schools. This arrangement also posed problems, as is indicated in one of the cases, when the area of responsibility of the assistant superintendent was limited to secondary schools, and the LEA title I projects emphasized the involvement of elementary school children. In an extraordinary demonstration of communication breakdown within the Catholic school system, the assistant superintendent failed to sense any necessity or desirability of conveying the LEA invitation to discuss title I activities to any other Catholic school administrator.

In dioceses which have set up a director of governmental programs, this official was probably the person with whom the LEA coordinator should have established contact. But again, unless the LEA is located near the diocesan see city, the public school officials are likely to be unaware of the existence of such a liaison person. Even when LEA officials know of the operations of a governmental program coordinator at the diocesan superintendent's office, they will probably seek a more local contact if the diocesan office is located some considerable distance away.

But uncertainty and inconsistency were also characteristic of contacts between LEA coordinators and Catholic school officials, particularly in medium and small LEA's. In the smaller LEA's contacts between public and private school officials frequently involved communication between the LEA coordinator and the pastor of the local Catholic church, or the principal of the parish school. Pastors with isolationist or separatist points of view, or who had a personal disinterest or aversion for Federal programs could refuse to cooperate with LEA officials in any way and effectively preclude the participation of children from his parish school.

Since the planning of title I projects and the writing of the applications was typically done by officials in the central LEA office, without involving the principals of the public schools in any intensive way, LEA coordinators who contacted Catholic school principals as the representatives of the nonpublic sector found themselves in a somewhat awkward position. Frequently the Catholic school principals, like the pastors, had little knowledge of the provisions of the legislation or of the kinds of benefits which could legally be made available to eligible children in their schools. In addition, the principals experienced some uncertainty about their authority to enter into formal arrangements with public school officials.

The organizational structure of the Catholic schools, with their complex network of responsibility and authority, and with a generally weak approach to internal coordination, posed problems of communication between LEA's and this large segment of nonpublic education during fiscal year 1966. The situation is one which requires the attention of high level officials of Catholic education if greater effectiveness and efficiency are to characterize future working relationships between the two systems at the local level. Particularly for medium and small LEA's which are located at a considerable distance from the diocesan school office, there is a pressing need for an official designation of the proper representative of Catholic education in the community.

In this study of the relationships between local administrators of the public and nonpublic schools, the superintendent of schools and the LEA title I coordinator were the public school officials who were most frequently involved, but depending on the option exercised by the LEA, the non-public-school representative ranged from the diocesan superintendent to the principal of a Catholic elementary or secondary school located in the local target area. The summarization of the relationships between educators at such diverse levels of authority is difficult because of the limited character of the generalizations which may be formulated. Nonetheless, the reports submitted by the field survey coordinators support the conclusion that the effectiveness of contacts between public and non-public-school personnel within an LEA appears to be more a function of the personalities involved than of any other factor. The quality of the relationship between administrators of the two sectors does not appear to be systematically related to either the size of the LEA or to its regional location.

The nature of these relationships varied from close mutual involvement in the planning of projects to the extremely superficial approach in which LEA's merely mailed announcements of their approved projects to private school administrators. Other ways in which non-public-school representatives were involved in title I activities included: assisting public school officials in identifying children who were eligible for participation, providing information about the needs of educationally deprived children in their schools, working out the details of the procedures for implementing the involvement of non-public-school pupils, suggesting projects which were favored by local private school educators, and merely being asked to provide a written endorsement of a project proposal which had been unilaterally developed by the LEA.

The field survey coordinators reported in almost all of the LEA's studied that contact between officials of the two school systems was almost nonexistent prior to title I. Typically it was a case of each sector going its own way, with no interest in cooperation, but generally with respect for each other's educational programs. LEA officials appeared to have some knowledge of the problems facing the Catholic schools in the community: limited financial support, large class sizes, noncertified teachers, lack of ancillary services, and restricted curriculum offerings. The advent of title I has had the effect of bringing administrators of the two systems into some kind of contact. In most cases they have had personal contact, discussed title I involvement, and come to some understanding of each other's positions.

The most frequent dissatisfaction expressed by non-public-school officials pertained to what they saw as substantial differences between the thrust of projects as they were approved and implemented and the character of the projects which had been discussed and presumably agreed upon in preliminary meetings with LEA personnel. In one community, for example, a proposal for a remedial reading project, which had been jointly planned and would be available to non-public-school children, was scrapped by the LEA and a proposal involving the purchase of mobile equipment was substituted, and later approved by the SEA.

While many LEA's provided opportunities for some degree of involvement in discussing plans for projects by the representatives of private schools, in no instance were they involved in the preparation of the project evaluation reports. In a small number of cases a copy of the completed evaluation was sent to the non-public-school contact. But in most of the LEA's not even this courtesy was extended. Some non-public-school administrators appeared to be unaware of the requirement of the evaluation aspect of the project.

A general impression created by the reports of the field survey coordinators is that, while LEA personnel were better informed about the guidelines and rules and regulations pertaining to title I than their counterparts from the private sector, both were hampered during fiscal year 1966 by substantial ignorance of precisely what arrangements could and could not be supported legally. Misunderstandings on both sides gave rise to animosities and antagonisms in a small number of cases. However, the church-state issue did not appear to be a factor of any great significance in the relationships between public and private school administrators.

2. *Extent of involvement* (*LEA*)

The percentage of the total participants in title I projects who were children in nonpublic schools ranged—for the 10 large LEA's—from 23.5 percent to 1.78 percent. For the medium size LEA's the highest percentage of non-public-school participants was 20.71, and two of the LEA's had no private-school children in the projects. The data for the small LEA's extend from a high of 41.94 percent to 0 percent. The median percentages for the three categories are 6.50 percent for large LEA's, 2.67 percent for medium LEA's, and 13.39 percent for small LEA's. The identification of the factors which have produced these striking differences between the three classes of LEA's is not possible in the present study, but this is an aspect of title I implementation which should be examined intensively in an investigation carried out during the second phase of this project. It should be recalled that the data in table 64 indicated the existence of a significant positive relationship, in small LEA's, between the percent of non-public-school participants and the ratio of the total number of eligible children to the total number of participants. The mean eligible: participant ratios for large, medium, and small LEA's were 1:1.54, 1:1.70, and 1:1.32, which rank the three types of LEA's in exactly the reverse order of their ranks for percentage of non-public-school participants. LEA's in which the number of eligible children approximates the number of participants tend to have a higher percentage of private-school children in title I projects than do LEA's in which participants substantially outnumber the count of eligible children.

The most important factor which acted to hold down the enrollment of private-school children in title I projects was the scheduling of the activities at times and places which made it difficult, if not impossible, for eligible children from these schools to be present. In communities where academic year projects were housed exclusively in public schools, where all activities were carried out during regular school hours, where private schools were located at a considerable distance from the project location, and where free busing was not available to children in nonpublic schools, a most effective barrier to participation was clearly present. LEA projects which provided services on private-school premises, or which were conducted after school hours, on Saturdays, or during the summer provided a more realistic opportunity for private-school children to share in the project benefits. As a general rule the greater possibility of participation was matched by the larger numbers of non-public-school students listed as participating in evaluation reports.

A factor which served to bring substantially noncomparable benefits to eligible private-school children was the appreciable number of projects in which funds were used exclusively to hire additional public-school teachers in order to reduce teacher-pupil ratios, to conduct in-service training programs for teachers (with private-school teachers ruled ineligible for participation), to improve the administrative services within a public-school system, to purchase special equipment which in some cases was never or only infrequently made available for use by teachers in private schools, and to employ teacher aides who were assigned only to public-school classrooms. While this aspect of title I projects will be examined in greater detail in the following section of this chapter, it is appropriate at this point to indicate that in large LEA's projects falling in this category accounted for 41.5 percent of the title I supported activities during fiscal year 1966, for 31.4 percent of the funded projects in medium LEA's, and 17.2 percent in small LEA's.

The foregoing figures suggest the question: Was the focus of title I projects during fiscal year 1966 determined by a study of the educational needs of eligible children in both public and private schools, or by the perceptions of LEA administrators of those facets of the local public school where they, rather than all eligible children, could gain from title I?

The centrality of the LEA, as intended by the legislation, is apparent in the cases included in this survey. Not only were many projects of such a nature as to have no significant impact on children attending private schools, but also a prevalent mode of operation consisted of focusing project activities on the needs of public-school children and then assuming that the program would be equally geared to the needs of educationally and economically deprived children in private schools. The dominant approach of LEA officials appears to have been to design projects which met their perception of the needs of the public education sector, and to then attempt to accommodate private-school students who had corresponding needs. While legally defensible, a problem with this approach was that available space on public-school grounds was so limited that quotas for non-public-school students were established by some LEA's. In such circumstances it seems clear that the requirement of substantial comparability of benefits provided for eligible children in both school systems was not met.

Independently of the percentage of title I participants who came from private schools, an important weakness evident in practically all LEA's is the failure to provide officials of the private schools from which the children came with data pertaining to their experiences and progress. This is indicative of the fact that the viewpoint of shared responsibility and of cooperative effort in eliminating the status of educational deprivation for private-school pupils has not characteristically been accepted or internalized by LEA officials.

While it is not possible in the present study to estimate the number of eligible children who may be victimized by it, an aspect of title I implementation which appears to warrant more careful consideration by LEA officials is the plight of private-school students who reside in a target area but whose school happens to be located beyond the bounds of the defined target area. The problem here is that eligible children attending private schools not located in a target area are being denied the help they need and would presumably receive if the school of their choice had happened to be located within the limits of the area used to establish eligibility for title I funds. The USOE guidelines for title I state:

> If there are educationally deprived children who reside in the applicant's district but attend a private school located in the district of another local educational agency and if there is no practicable way for the applicant to provide opportunities for their participation in the project, the applicant may wish to consider entering into a cooperative agreement with the other local educational agency. Under such a cooperative agreement, the local educational agencies could jointly provide educational opportunities geared to the needs of the educationally deprived children in both districts who are enrolled in that private school.

In none of the communities included in this survey was there evidence of any attempt at cooperative agreements among LEA's in order to provide title I benefits for eligible children who attend private schools outside the boundary of the LEA in which the child resides.

In summary, the extent of the participation of eligible private-school children in the benefits of title I programs in a particular LEA is a function of three factors: (1) State constitutional provisions affecting such matters as free busing of private-school children and the rulings of attorneys general on points where ESEA authorized activities may conflict with the intent of the State constitution or with decisions of State courts; (2) the readiness of private-school officials to insist on benefits for their students comparable to those provided for public-school participants; and (3) the philosophy of the LEA as reflected in the preparation of project applications with varying degrees of feasibility of participation and varying levels of emphasis on children's needs—both considered from the point of view of the eligible child in a private school. The evidence for fiscal year 1966 from 30 LEA's reveals glaring differences with respect to each factor and leads to the conclusion that the achievement of the goal of comparable title I benefits for all eligible children in a State, regardless of the type of school they attend, will require greater devotion to that concept and more ingenious methods of implementation than were prevalent during the first year of ESEA.

3. Character of projects, fiscal year 1966

Table 65 presents a summary of the general thrust of 146 title I projects which were sponsored by the 30 LEA's in this study during fiscal year 1966. In order to facilitate the comparison of project emphasis, data are presented separately for the three categories of LEA size, and for the total sample of 30 cases.

As shown in the table, the highest percentage of title I projects approved for large LEA's was for activities related to reading. These were almost exclusively remedial in character and pertained to children at the elemenetary-school level. Programs of this type were also the most frequent projects for medium and small LEA's.

TABLE 65.—FREQUENCY AND PERCENT OF PROJECT TYPES FOR LARGE, MEDIUM, AND SMALL LEA'S

Project type	Large LEA		Medium LEA		Small LEA		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
1. Counseling and guidance	8	9.8	4	11.4	1	3.4	13	8.9
2. Reading programs	11	13.4	7	20.0	13	44.8	31	21.2
3. Teacher inservice training	10	12.2	2	5.7	2	6.9	14	9.6
4. Summer camping programs	1	1.2	1	2.9	0	0	2	1.4
5. Field trips	1	1.2	0	0	0	0	1	.7
6. Music and art	3	3.7	1	2.9	0	0	4	2.7
7. Use of leisure time	2	2.4	1	2.9	0	0	3	2.1
8. Teacher aides	3	3.7	0	0	0	0	3	2.1
9. Health services	6	7.3	2	5.7	3	10.3	11	7.5
10. Improvement of academic subjects (other than reading)	7	8.5	3	8.6	4	13.8	14	9.6
11. Reduction of class size	4	4.9	4	11.4	0	0	8	5.6
12. Special education	9	11.0	5	13.5	3	10.3	17	11.6
13. Improvement of administrative services	7	8.5	1	2.9	2	6.9	10	6.8
14. Purchase of special equipment	10	12.2	4	11.4	1	3.4	15	10.3
Total	82	------	35	------	29	------	146	------

It is of interest to note that for small LEA's programs designed to improve reading skills were proportionately more than three times as common as in large LEA's.

In the large LEA's the two next most common types of title I projects involved the purchase of mobile equipment (12.2 percent of approved applications), and in-service training programs for public-school teachers (also 12.2 percent). As has been cited earlier, the benefit from such projects accruing to private school children is almost nil. For medium LEA's projects in the field of special education ranked second (13.5 percent), and applications for the purchase of equipment, for the hiring of additional public school teachers, and for improving guidance and counseling services each accounted for an additional 11.4 percent of approved projects.

In the small LEA's the rank order of activities specified in approved project applications, after the modal emphasis on reading programs, was: Improvement of performance in academic subjects other than reading, 13.8 percent; special education, 10.3 percent; and health services, 10.3 percent. The focus of projects in small LEA's appears to be more directly and immediately oriented to student benefit than in the large and medium LEA's.

D. *Conclusion*

The study of the 30 cases presented in this report reveals a wide range of differences in almost every aspect that has been considered. It is clear that operations in fiscal year 1966 were hampered by the short period of time which LEA's had at their disposal in planning projects. It is evident that complex and sensitive legal issues had to be resolved before projects could become operational in many States. Neither public nor private school officials were adequately prepared for the task of making the benefits readily available to eligible students, regardless of the auspices of the school which they attended. There is no doubt that differences in the personalities of officials involved, differences in individual understandings of the intent of ESEA, and differences in perceptions of the needs of educationally deprived children combined to generate a spectrum of projects which varied greatly in the cost per participant and in the degree of involvement of children from nonpublic schools. It could hardly have been otherwise in the first year of an operation which had all the characteristics of a "crash" program.

The operation of title I during its first year was inevitably characterized by misunderstanding, inefficiency, and uncertainty. Its most valuable service during fiscal year 1966 was perhaps to indicate the barriers to effective communication and cooperation between the public and private schools of the Nation which must be hurdled if the full promise of ESEA is to be realized. The impact of title I on nonpublic schools during the period with which this study is concerned was largely in terms of identifying and isolating problems, internal and external, which need attention. To have achieved that is to have done much.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Amount expended—The total cost of all title I programs within a single State, or within an LEA.

Diocesan director of Government programs—An official employed by the diocesan school system who has the primary responsibility for administering all Government programs operating in the diocese.

Diocesan school system—A Roman Catholic educational agency which consists of elementary and secondary schools located within the territorial jurisdiction of a bishop.

Dual enrollment—An arrangement whereby a child regularly and concurrently attends a public school part time and a nonpublic school part time pursuing part of his studies under the control of the public school and the remaining part under the direction and control of the nonpublic school.

Duplicated count—The total number of children participating in all projects.

Educationally deprived children—Those children in a particular school district who have the greatest need for special educational assistance in order that their level of educational attainment may be raised to that appropriate for children of their age.

Eligible children—Children within a school district, aged 5 to 17, from families with an annual income of less than $2,000, as shown in the 1960 census. This low-income formula identified the attendance area to be served. Educational deprivation determined who may participate in the project.

ESEA—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Expenditure per participant—The total amount of funds expended on the title I program divided by the total number of children participating in the title I program.

Field survey coordinator—An individual employed by the Boston College ESEA title I project, who compiled information and conducted interviews in selected sample communities.

Fiscal year 1966—July 1, 1965 to June 30, 1966.

LEA—Local educational agency under the leadership of the local public school district.

LEA title I coordinator—An official of the local school district entrusted with the primary responsibility of administering title I.

Maximum basic grant—The total amount of funds which the U.S. Commissioner of Education authorizes to each State for grants to local educational agencies for each of the 3 years beginning July 1, 1965.

Nonpublic school—A school established by an agency other than the State, subdivisions of the State, or the Federal Government, which is supported by other than public funds, and the operation of whose program rests with other than publicly elected or appointed officials.

Non-school participants—Preschool children and/or dropouts from elementary or secondary schools.

Participant ratio—A method of expressing the relationship between the number of eligible children and the total number of participants in fiscal year 1966 title I programs.

Program—The aggregate of individual title I projects within the local school district.

Project applications—A proposal to the SEA for participation in title I, ESEA, incorporating a set of related services and activities designed to help meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Project area—That sector of the target area for which some specific need has been identified; a project application written, approved, and implemented.

Public school—A school established by publicly appointed or elected school officials in which the programs and activities are under the control of these officials and which is supported by public funds.

SEA—State educational agency under the leadership of the State superintendent of schools or State commissioner of education.

SEA title I director—An official of the State department of education entrusted with the primary responsibility for administering title I on a statewide basis.

Shared facilities—An arrangement which could be interpreted in one of two ways: (1) public school buildings, sites, or equipment regularly used without rental fee by non-public-school pupils who are under the immediate supervision and control of non-public-school officials, or (2) non-public-school buildings, sites, or equipment regularly used without rental fee by public school pupils who are under the immediate supervision and control of public school officials.

Shared services—An arrangement whereby specialists are employed by the public school system to render services on a part-time basis to eligible non-public-school children.

Shared time—An ambiguous term which has been avoided because it has often been confused with the terms "dual enrollment," "shared facilities," and "released time."

State interim report—A preliminary survey indicating the initial progress of title I, activities which SEA's submitted to the USOE, in December 1965.

Target area—A geographic portion of an LEA district where there are high concentrations of educationally deprived children from low income families.

Unduplicated count—The total number of children participating in all projects less the number of children deducted from double counting.

USOE—U.S. Office of Education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"Administrator's Guide to the E.S.E.A." *American School and University*, 38 (February, 1966), 39–41.

Alford, A. L., "E.S.E.A. of 1965: What to Anticipate." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 46 (June, 1965), 483–88.

Arnold, W. M. "Qualifying for Federal Funds." *American School Board Journal*, 150 (April, 1965), 33–35.

Bloom, A. M., "Johnson's Program—Deserves Professional Support." *American School and University*, 37 (May, 1965), 7.

Breen, J. L. "Education Act Provides a Million Dollar Budget for Physical Education." *Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation*, 38 (March, 1967), 96.

Brickman, W. W. "President Johnson's Educational Program for all Children." *School and Society*, 93 (June, 1965), 288.

Brigham, B. W. "Unique Features of Title I in Delaware." *Reading Teacher*, 20 (January, 1967), 234–27.

Bruce, V. C. "Federal Aid and Central." *American School Board Journal*, 152 (January, 1966), 28.

Carey, H. L. "E.S.E.A. of 1965: A Good Beginning." *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin*, 62 (August, 1965), 239–44.

Celio, V. "Implications of Title I, E.S.E.A." *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin*, 63 (August, 1966), 301–03.

Chase, F. S. "Educational Policy of the Federal Level." *Wisconsin Journal of Education*, 97 (February, 1965), 25–26.

Clasen, R. E. and Miller, D. M., "Approach to Planning Educational Projects Meriting Federal Support." *Wisconsin Journal of Education*, 98 (December, 1965), 12–15.

Cogan, C. "Federal Aid to Education: The Changing Picture." *American Teacher Magazine*, 49 (February, 1965), 3.

Conley, W. H. "Educational Bill." *Catholic School Journal*, 65 (May, 1965), 4.

Davey, C. P. "Philosophy Behind E.S.E.A. of 1965." *Catholic Education Review*, 64 (January, 1966), 6–11.

Davis, Jr. O. L. "Title I, What A First Inning." *Educational Leadership*, 24 (October, 1966), 13–20.

"Educators Appraise Federal Laws." *Pennsylvania School Journal*, 113 (January, 1965), 214–16.

"Effect of Federal Funds." *National Education Association Journal*, 55 (September, 1966), 10.

Elam, S. M. "Federal School Legislation Sweeping Change with Incalculable Ramifications." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 47 (September, 1965), 1.

———. "Johnsonian Compromise Could Wreck Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 46 (February, 1965), 249.

"E.S.E.A. of 1965." *A.L.A. (American Library Association)*, 59 (March, 1965), 184–185.

"E.S.E.A. of 1965." *Grade Teacher*, 82 (May, 1965), 75–76.

Eshleman, W. "Federal Aid: A Helping Hand to the States." *Arizona Teacher*, 53 (May, 1965), 12–13.

Exton, E. "Federal Program Budgeting Is a Step Toward Centralized Education Planning." *School Board Journal*, 153 (November, 1966), 39.

———. "How Will the School Board Meet the Growing Federal Challenge to Their Leadership?" *American School Board Journal*, 151 (August, 1965), 5–6.

———. "Time for School Boards to Study the New Federal Partnership." *American School Board Journal*, 154 (March, 1967), 43–45.

———. "Title I and II Budget Cuts Irk Congress." *American School Board Journal*, 152 (May, 1966), 15–16.

———. "Will The New Federal Aids Strengthen or Weaken the Public Schools?" *American School Board Journal*, 150 (February, 1965), 25–26.

"Federal Aid to State Department of Education." *School and Society*, 94 (July, 1966), 260.

"Federal Education Budget in Detail." *School and Community*, 53 (April, 1967), 8.

"Federal Funds Aid Deprived Students." *Minnesota Journal of Education*, 47 (November, 1966), 29–30.

"Federal Money for Education: For Assistance to States Under E.S.E.A. of 1965—Fiscal Year, 1966." *American Education*, 1 (November, 1965), 26–27.

"Federal Money for Education (cont.)." *American Education*, 2 (May, 1966), 28–29.

"Federal Money for Education." *American Education*, 3 (February, 1967), 14–16.

"Federal Support Bill Advances." *School and Community*, 51 (April, 1965), 8–9.

Fielding, B. "Federal Funds to Meet Local Needs." *National Education Association Journal*, 55 (September, 1966), 23–26.

"First Work of These Times: Description and Analysis of the E.S.E.A. of 1965." *American Education*, 1 (April, 1965), 13–20.

"First Work of These Times: Description and Analysis of the E.S.E.A. of 1965." *American School and University*, 37 (June, 1965), 21–28.

"Fiscal Year 1966: Administrator's Guide to a Year of Participation in the Federal Aid to Higher Education and Elementary and Secondary Education Acts (with reports from the states)." *American School and University*, 39 (December, 1966), 27–31.

Fister, J. B. and Kelley, D. M. "Churchman's Guide to E.S.E.A. of 1965." *Instructional Journal of Religious Education*, 2 (May, 1966), 16–19.

Friends, G. and Kerach, W. "Federal Money: Have We the Brains to Use It Wisely?" *Instruction*, 76 (August, 1966), 82.

Fuller, E. "Government Financing of Public and Private Education." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 47 (May, 1966), 365–72.

Fulton, R. A. "Under Contract Training in State-Federal Programs: Legislation That Makes Federal Funds Available for Private Business School." *Balance Sheet*, 46 (April, 1965), 349–351.

Garber, L. O. "Make Sure Your Budget Has a Place for Federal Funds." *Nation's Schools*, 78 (September, 1966), 79–80.

Gardiner, J. W. and Schuchat, T. "E.S.E.A.'s Wonderful First Year." *Grade Teacher*, 83 (May, 1966), 78–79.

Gardner, J. and Howe, H. "What Are Americans Receiving in Return for Their Heavy Investment in Education?" *American Education*, 2 (November, 1966), 24–26.

Gidense, H. D. "New and Worth Reading: The E.S.E.A. of 1965."*National Elementary Principal*, 45 (September, 1965), 59–63.

Goff, R. "Promises Fulfilled: Progress Under Title I of E.S.E.A. of 1965." *American Education*, 2 (February, 1966), 10–17.

Grebe, E. L. "Planning Title I Projects." *School and Community*, 53 (February, 1967), 24.

"Guide to Federal Money for Education." *National Education Association Journal*, 55 (November, 1966), 55–56.

"Guidelines on Trial." *American Education*, 3 (March, 1967), 18–20.

Hahw, H. "Public School Support and Shared Time Programs." *Religious Education*, 60 (November, 1965), 456–59.

Hamlin, H. M. "Opportunity Unlimited." *Agricultural Education Magazine*, 39 (August, 1966), 78–79.

Harsh, J. R. "Evaluating E.S.E.A. Projects for the Disadvantaged." *Educational Leadership*, 24 (February, 1967), 453.

Harthshaw, W. C. "E.S.E.A., 1965,, *Educational Journal*, 52 (September, 1965), 65–67.

Haven, J. M. "Title I: How the Money Is Spent and What Services Are Provided." *Reading Teacher*, 20 (January, 1967), 295–96.

Health, J. "E.S.E.A., 1965—A Working Report." *Physical Educational Record*, 36 (September, 1965), 22–23.

Hill, F. W. "More Pupils, and More Services, More Problems, More Opportunities." *American School and University*, 38 (August, 1966), 61–62.

Howe II, H. "Schoolman Did an Extraordinary Title I Job." *Nation's Schools*, 79 (March, 1967), 42.

"How Title I Programs Follow Through on Head Start." *Grade Teacher*, 84 (December, 1966), 88–89.

"How to Choose a Title I Project." *Nation's Schools*, 76 (December, 1965), 19–21.

"How to Evaluate Your Federal Program." *Nation's Schools*, 77 (May, 1966), 49.

Hughes, J. F. "How to Use Federal Funds for Summer Programs." *Nation's Schools*, 79 (March, 1967), 132–34.

——— "Title I—E.S.E.A., 1965." *Audiovisual Instructor*, 10 (October, 1965), 616–17.

Hyer, A. L. "Implementing the New Legislation." *Audiovisual Instructor*, 10 (October, 1965), 682.

"Interview with Francis Keppel." *American Education*, 2 (July, 1966), 11–13.

Jacobs, J. M. and Garo, M. J. "School in the Importance of Programs Possible Under Title I, E.S.E.A., 1965." *American School Board*, 151 (September, 1965), 5–6.

Johnson, B. L. "These Are the Basic Conflicts in Federal Aid: Race, Religion, Interstate Rivalry, Urban vs. Rural Interests." *Kentucky School Journal*, 43 (February, 1965) 18–21.

Kelley, D. M. "Elementary and Secondary Education Act." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 41 (March, 1967), 684–93.

Keppel, F. "Keppel Tells How New Laws Will Work." *Nation's Schools*, 75 (May, 1965), 22–22B.

Koob, Rev. C. A. "Where Is E.S.E.A. Leading Catholic Religion?" *Catholic School Journal*, 67 (March, 1967), 45–48.

Krettek, G. and Cooke, E. D. "E.S.E.A. of 1965: The Higher Education Act of 1965." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 39 (March, 1965), 583–585.

——— "Washington Report," *A.L.A.*, 59 (April, 1965), 259–260.

Lamb, W. H. "Federal Efforts to Promote Equality in Educational Opportunity." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 46 (February, 1965), 263–264.

———. "Tactics and Strategy of Federal Education Efforts." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 46 (January, 1965), 211–212.

———. "Quiet Revolution Gets Started." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 46 (April, 1965), 392–394.

Lewis, P. "E. S. E. A. of 1965—Title I: Designing Projects," *Audiovisual Instructor*, 10 (November, 1965), 722–23.

Lindsay, F. B. "New Look: Goals and Purposes of Secondary Education: E. S. E. A. and Teachers." *National Association Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 50 (April, 1966), 260–261.

Lorethen, J. O. "How Are the Fedral Programs Working in the Large Cities?" *Educational Leadership*, 23 (October, 1965), 20–6.

Mackie, R. P., "Opportunities for Education of Handicapped Under Title I—PL 89–10." *Exceptional Children*, 32 (May, 1966), 593–98.

McCarren, E. P. "What the Informed Public Should Know About E. S. E. A. of 1965." *Catholic Education Review*, 63 (November, 1965), 505–23.

McFarland, J. W. "Focus on Achievement: Houston, First City in the Nation with an Approved Program Under Title I." *Texas Outlook*, 50 (February, 1966), 29–39.

McKay, Robert "The President's Program: A New Commitment to Quality and Equality in Education," *Phi Delta Kappan* (May, 1965).

McKenney, J. W. "Time of Transition." *C. T. A. Journal*, 65 (October, 1965), 4–7.

McPherson, R. B. "Will Classrooms and Schools Built with Federal Funds Be Integrated?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 48 (September, 1966), 11–15.

Megal, C. J. "President Johnson's Program for Federal Aid to Education." *American Teacher Magazine*, 49 (February, 1965), 9–10.

Meister, Morris and Tauber, Abraham "Experiments in Expanding Educational Opportunity for the Disadvantaged." *Phi Delta Kappan* (March, 1965).

Molloy, E. J. "Partnership between Public and Private Education." *National Catholic Education Association Bulletin*, 63 (August, 1966), 297–300.

Morse, A. L. "How to Get Going with Federal Funds." *Grade Teacher*, 83 (November, 1965), 72.

"Morse—Corey Amendments, New Portent for Exceptional Children." *Exceptional Child*, 33 (December, 1966), 269–71.

Morse, W. E. "Role of Government Education Changes." *Audiovisual Instructor*, 10 (October, 1965), 616–617.

Mosher, C. "Creature of Apathy and Ignorance." *Ohio School*, 43 (September, 1965), 9–10.

"N.E.A. Back L.B.J. Proposals." *Michigan Educational Journal*, 42 (February, 1965), 34–35.

Neace, N. S. "Purposes, Progress, and Promise of Title I, E. S. E. A." *Illinois Education*, 55 (March, 1967), 313–316.

Nelson, R. "Title I in Missouri in Dollars and Sense." *School and Community*, 53 (October, 1966), 22–25.

"New Federal Support Bill Backed by N.E.A.—E. S. E. A. of 1965." *School and Community*, 51 (May, 1965), 36–37.

Osborne, B. "E. S. E. A. of 1965." *Clearing House*, 40 (November, 1965), 190–92.

Pape, G. "Titled Teacher Reports in a Title I Reading Clinic in Her Schools." *Texas Outlook*, 51 (February, 1967), 30–31.

Parker, F. "Federal Aid and the General Welfare." *Educational Leadership*, 24 (October, 1966), 33–35.

Pasquini, L. A. "Programs for the Educationally Disadvantaged Children, Evaluation of Title I, E. S. E. A. of 1965." *New York State Education*, 53 (March, 1966), 24–25.

"Path to Federal Aid Is Far From Smooth." *Catholic School Journal*, 66 (May, 1966), 78.

Peck, R. "Northern Montana E. S. E. A. Planning Project." *Montana Education*, 43 (September, 1966), 28–30.

Perkins, H. V. "Federal Participation and Its Results." *Educational Leadership*, 24 (October, 1966), 39.

Petry, J. J. "Time for Cooperation: The E. S. E. A. of 1965." *Catholic School Journal*, 65 (September, 1965), 41–43.

Plitz, A. and Murphy, J. T. "Plan Now to Use the New Education Act." *Instructor*, 4 (June, 1965), 5.

Powell, A. C. "Role of Education in the War vs. Poverty." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 49 (March, 1965), 56–66.

"President's Fourth Message on Education." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 41 (April, 1967), 773.

"President's Proposed Education Programs." *A.L.A. Bulletin*, 61 (April, 1967), 383–84.

Reed, W. O. "Federal Government and Education." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 49 (March), 151–157.

"Report on Federal Legislation." *The Volta Review*, 68 (September, 1966), 492–93.

"1967 Report on Federal Money and Recent Legislation for Education." *American Education*, 3 (February, 1967), 13–24.

Rice, A. H. "Are Federal Funds Leading Schools the Wrong Way?" *Nation's Schools*, 76 (October, 1965), 28.

———. "Federal Guidelines Actually Control Public School Policy (with reply by D. S. Seeley)." *Nation's Schools*, 77 (June, 1966), 10–11.

Schenk, G. K. "Service to Schools." *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 40 (June, 1966), 968.

"Schoolman's Guide to Federal Aid: E. S. E. A." *School Management*, 9 (June, 1965), 96–101.

"Schoolman's Guide to Federal Aid (cont.)." *School Management*, 10 (May, 1966) 155–77.

"Schoolman's Guide to Federal Aid (cont.)." *School Management*, (December, 1966), 60–67.

"Schoolman's Gripe About E. S. E. A. Paper Work." *Nation's Schools*, 79 (January, 1967), 77.

"Schools Use Title Funds for Bigger, Better Food Programs." *Nation's Schools*, 78 (September, 1966), 91–96.

Seaborg, G. T. "Science, the Humanities, and the Federal Government." *American Education* 2 (September, 1966), 8–11.

Shellhammer, T. "E. S. E. A. I, Compensatory Education Projects with Special Reference to Progress Evaluation." *California Education*, 3 (January, 1966), 23–24.

Shores, J. H. "Federal Funds: To Assist or To Control?" *Educational Leadership*, 24 (October, 1966), 7–9.

Smith, G. G. "Federal Programs Affecting Education: E. S. E. A." *Education*, 54 (February, 1966), 269–71.

Smith, G. R. "How to Write a Project Proposal: Applying for Research Funds." *Nation's Schools*, 76 (August, 1965), 33–35.

Stanely, R. J. "E. S. E. A., 1965." *Audiovisual Instructor*, 10 (October, 1965), 630–32.

Strasser, Jr., W. C. "Education Act of 1965: Implications for Non-Public Schools." *Phi Delta Kappa*, 47 (September, 1965), 24–26.

———, "Patterns, Reactions, and Problems." *Phi Delta Kappan*, (June, 1965).

Swindle, B. "Goal of Title I: A Fair Deal for the Educationally Deprived." *Texas Outlook*, 51 (February, 1967), 28–29.

Tanzman, J. "E. S. E. A.: Three Ways to Make Your Audio-Visual Knowledge Count." *Audiovisual Instructor*, 11 (December, 1966), 797–99.

"The ABC's of Implementing Title I, II, and III of E. S. E. A.—1965, PL 89-10." *American School Board Journal*, 151 (July, 1965), 5–13.

"Title I: Financial Assistance to Local Education of Low-Income Families." *Theory Into Practice*, 5 (June, 1966), 101–43.

"Title I and Reading." *Reading Teacher*, 20 (January, 1967), 295–338.

"War on Educational Poverty." *Kentucky School Journal*, 43 (February, 1965), 24–25.

"Washington's Helping Hand." *Ohio Schools*, 44 (December, 1966), 18–20.

"Washington Report: Directory of Legislation Passed and Pending." *Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation*, 37 (October, 1966), 23–25.

"Washington Report on Federal Support to Health, Physical Education, and Recreation." *Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation*, 37 (October, 1966), 17–32.

Wayson, W. W. "Political Revolution in Education, 1965." *Phi Delta Kappan*, 47 (March, 1966), 333–39.

"We've Got It Started." *C. T. A. Journal*, 61 (October, 1965), 31–37.

"We've Got It Started." *Illinois Education*, 54 (September, 1965), 23–29.

"We've Got It Started." *N. E. A. Journal*, 54 (September, 1965), 33–39.

"What E. S. E. A. Amendments Will Mean to Schools." *Nation's Schools*, 78 December, 1966), 19.

"What E. S. E. A. Funds Are Doing for Teachers and Pupils." *Grade Teacher*, 83 (May, 1966), 2.

"What's New in the E. S. E. A. Amendments?" *American Education*, 3 (February, 1967), 18–20.

Wickline, L. E. "Supporting Role of E. S. E. A." *Instruction*, 75 (May, 1966), 98.

Wirtz, M. A. and Chalfant, J. C. "E. S. E. A.: Implications for Handicapped Children." *Exceptional Children*, 32 (November, 1965), 139–46.

Withan, A. P. "It Will Take Innovation, Teachers with Understanding, Seeking, Using Title I Funds." *Michigan Educational Journal*, 43 (February, 1966), 16–20.

Wolfe, D. P. "E. S. E. A. of 1965: A New Federal Law on Education." *Childhood Education*, 42 (September, 1965), 12–14.

○